

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, March 18, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, the Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am authorized to report back without amendment the bill H. R. 1438.

The SPEAKER. By direction of the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] reports back the following House bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication (H. Doc. No. 3) from the Postmaster-General:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1909.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a schedule of papers and documents which are not needed in the transaction of public business and which have no permanent value or historical interest:

1. Reports regarding condemned waste materials, prior to January, 1908.
2. Reports of "Cash on hand" in the office of the disbursing clerk, 1906-1908.
3. Reports of "Condition of business" in the various bureaus of Department, 1906-1908.
4. Reports as to condition of appropriations for contingent expenses, prior to July, 1907.
5. Proposals for services, Post-Office Department, 1908.
6. Proposals for purchase of waste materials, 1908.
7. Proposals for painting interior of department building, 1906.
8. Requests for passes to department building, 1907-8.
9. Requests from postmasters for permission to dispose of old Postal Guides, etc., prior to July, 1908.
10. Requests for copies of the Postal Guide, prior to July, 1908.
11. Requests for copies of the Postal Laws and Regulations, prior to July, 1908.
12. Requests for copies of the annual reports, prior to July, 1908.
13. Carbon copies of directions to travel, prior to January, 1908.
14. Letters from various divisions of department indicating useless files, prior to 1907.
15. Letters indicating apportionment of appropriations, 1906-7.
16. Civil-service certificates returned without selection, prior to July, 1908.
17. Book in regard to advertising, prior to 1892.

NOTE.—The papers listed in the above 17 items are now stored in the office of the chief clerk of the department.

18. Cases relating to registered matter, Class A, Nos. 167891 to 178201, both numbers inclusive, covering the period from January 1, 1905, to December 31, 1905, making a total of 10,311 cases.
 19. Cases relating to ordinary mail, Class B, Nos. 559338 to 763824, both numbers inclusive, covering the period from January 2, 1906, to July 13, 1907, making a total of 204,487 cases.
 20. Cases relating to matter dispatched to or from foreign countries, Class F, Nos. 56967 to 87733, both numbers inclusive, covering the period from January 1, 1905, to January 1, 1906, making a total of 30,767 cases.
 21. Jackets and carbon jackets of "S" cases from 80001 to 99714, both numbers inclusive, covering the period up to May 13, 1907.
 22. Jackets of "I" cases from 63307 to 96948, both numbers inclusive, covering the period up to and including July 15, 1906.
 23. Advices of the appointment clerk affecting post-office inspectors, prior to July 1, 1908.
 24. Records of pay accounts of post-office inspectors and rural agents, prior to July 1, 1906.
 25. Applications of post-office inspectors and clerks at division headquarters and records of leave of absence granted prior to January 1, 1907.
 26. Monthly certifications of inspectors in charge of salaries due post-office inspectors prior to January 1, 1909.
 27. Cash statements from December 31, 1901, up to and including December 31, 1904.
 28. Requisitions of clerks in charge for supplies, and the repair of furniture, etc., from January 1, 1908, to January 1, 1909.
 29. Requisitions of division headquarters for supplies prior to January 1, 1909, and receipts of division headquarters for supplies from January 1, 1908, to January 1, 1909.
 30. Forms 562 and 591, from July, 1907, to July, 1908.
 31. Forms 594 and 595, from July, 1907, to July, 1908.
 32. Statements of clerks in regard to cases referred and returned from July, 1907, to July, 1908.
- NOTE.—The papers, etc., listed under items 18 to 32, both inclusive, are stored in the office of the chief inspector. Such cases and papers as from their nature or for other reasons it is thought best to retain permanently to be excepted from the above list.
33. Statements of the weights of mails dispatched to foreign countries up to June 30, 1907, except to those relating to dispatches from Honolulu.
 34. Routine reports in connection with details of contract ocean mail service up to June 30, 1907.
 35. Miscellaneous letters and papers of no permanent value received up to December 31, 1907, which have been fully acted upon and which are therefore of no value for future reference.
 36. Five hundred pamphlets, regulations for promotion of railway postal clerks, 1903.
 37. Old requisitions for printing and binding, 1906, 1907, and 1908.
 38. Two thousand five hundred jackets, form 5169a.
 39. Five hundred jackets, form 5080a.
 40. Five hundred jackets, form 5083a.

41. Congressional Directory (3), 1905 and 1906.
42. Congressional Directory (6), 1907 and 1908.
43. Printed division orders, from 1895 to 1904, inclusive.
44. Statement of inner registered sacks, 1900 to 1904.
45. Statement of through registered pouches (established), 1901, 1902, 1903, and 1904.
46. Statement of register exchanges discontinued, 1903 to 1907.
47. Statement of temporary register exchanges, 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906.
48. Statement of weekly train reports, 1904.
49. Statement of discontinued register exchanges, 1902 to 1907.
50. Statement of unworked mails, 1906, 1907, 1908, and January, 1909.
51. Requisitions for printed facing slips, 1906, 1907, and 1908.
52. Copy of daily journal, 1905, 1906, 1907, and to June, 1908.
53. Copy for scheme of South Carolina, 1908.
54. Copy for scheme of New York, 1908.
55. Copy for scheme of Birmingham, Ala., 1908.
56. Copy for scheme of South Dakota, 1908.
57. Copy for scheme of Virginia-Chicago Stdpt., 1909.

NOTE.—The papers, etc., listed in items 33 to 35, inclusive, are stored in the Division of Foreign Mails; those listed in items 36 to 57, inclusive, are stored in the Division of Railway Mail Service, Bureau of Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

58. Summaries of postal account, 1904.
 59. Correspondence files, 1903.
 60. Advertisements for mail service for the term 1896-1902.
 61. Postmasters' requisitions on forms 3201, 3202, 3203, and 3285 for postage stamps, postal cards, plain stamped envelopes, newspaper wrappers, special-request envelopes, and postage-due stamps of a date prior to 1905.
 62. All postmasters' monthly stock reports on Form 3240 (discontinued by Postmaster-General's Order No. 874 of November 25, 1907).
 63. Notifications from the First and Fourth Assistant Postmasters-General of postmasters' appointments and changes of bonds of date prior to 1907.
 64. Miscellaneous correspondence.
 65. Post-office inspectors' forms relating to registry matters.
 66. Credit jackets from 1901 to 1904, inclusive.
 67. Ten receipt books, Nos. 53 to 62, inclusive.
- NOTE.—The papers, etc., listed in items 38 to 60 stored in Division of Finance; items 61 to 63, Division of Stamps; items 64 to 65, Division of Registered Mails; items 66 and 67, Division of Redemption, Bureau of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General.
68. Petitions for rural-delivery service, duplicate jackets, and other papers no longer necessary in connection with investigation and report on such petitions, filed up to and including December 31, 1907.
 69. Petitions for rural-delivery service adversely reported up to and including December 31, 1906.
 70. Inspection reports (Form 573-I) up to and including June 30, 1908, as to condition of rural-delivery service in connection with regular inspection of post-offices.
 71. Statistical reports of mail matter delivered and collected on rural routes up to and including the quarter ended December 31, 1907.
 72. Inspection jackets containing requests for amendments or changes in rural routes, from which the reports have been withdrawn up to and including December 31, 1907.
 73. Card records, inspection reports, and old requisitions dated prior to June 30, 1908.
 74. Three hundred and twenty-four bound volumes of records showing the receipt and disposition of mail matter prior to July 1, 1904.
- NOTE.—The papers, etc., listed in items 68 to 74, inclusive, are stored in the Bureau of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General.

Respectfully,

F. H. HITCHCOCK,
Postmaster-General.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The SPEAKER. Under the law the Speaker is required to appoint a committee of two to examine papers, with the end in view of their destruction, in whole or in part, according to the recommendations of the respective departments.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BATES] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. TALBOTT], who served upon this committee in the last Congress.

SMOKING IN THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will cause the following rule to be read:

The Clerk read section 7 of Rule XIV, as follows:

While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no Member shall walk out of or across the Hall, nor, when a Member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair; and during the session of the House no Member shall wear his hat, or remain by the Clerk's desk during the call of the roll or the counting of ballots, or smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause. Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has instructed both the Doorkeeper and the Sergeant-at-Arms, especially touching the clause in relation to smoking, to see that the rule is rigidly enforced.

MINORITY VIEWS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have until Tuesday next to file their views on the bill just reported.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] asks unanimous consent that the minority may have until Tuesday next to file their views in connection with the bill which has just been reported. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRINT OF TARIFF BILL.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 5.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the two Houses 30,000 copies of the bill of the House (H. R. 1438) entitled "A bill to provide revenue equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," with an index thereto, and the same number of the report thereon, 25,000 copies of said report to be accompanied with the views of the minority, all in document form, 9,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 21,000 copies for the use of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, these things are to go to the folding room, as I understand it.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that they will go there under the law.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the matter of going to the folding room or the document room, I simply would like to make this suggestion: Undoubtedly most of the documents ought to go to the folding room, where they are subject to the order of Members of Congress; yet it is an invariable practice of Members to send to the document room for documents of this kind; and unless some can be placed in the document room, Members on the floor who send out for the document can not get it.

Mr. PAYNE. The usual number of copies of this bill was printed yesterday, and nearly 2,000 copies are in the document room. I want to say, further, that the Committee on Ways and Means are having a comparative statement made of the present law and the proposed bill, and it is the purpose of the committee to ask to have this printed when it is prepared, probably not later than Monday next.

Mr. MANN. I have been informed by those in the document room that it is the constant practice of Members of the House to send to the document room for documents which they have to their credit in the folding room, and then a complaint is raised because they can not get a particular document in the document room after the print has been exhausted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think if the gentleman from Illinois will take five minutes some day to explain to the House all the particulars about the folding room and the document room, there would not be any trouble about that. The trouble here is that it is hard to get the hang of the thing.

Mr. MANN. What I wanted to point out was that it would be desirable for some copies to be kept in the document room, most of the copies going to the folding room to the credit of individual Members.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no objection to a reasonable number, say 500 or 1,000, being put in the document room.

Mr. MANN. The people in the document room do the very best they can.

Mr. TAWNEY. There are 2,000 copies in the document room now.

Mr. MANN. No; the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. PAYNE. Two thousand copies went to the document room yesterday, and there will be a reprint of the bill and 2,000 copies more will go to the document room with the report on the bill.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. And a reprint can be had at any time.

Mr. MANN. Two thousand copies went to the document room by reason of the bill being ordered printed, as the usual thing. Two thousand copies went to the document room yesterday, and the Clerk of the House, following the desire of the House, ordered a lot of extra copies, but that is not the usual way of having the documents printed.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I was informed by a gentleman who ought to understand this matter, if he did not, that, under the law, on the introduction of a bill 2,000 copies went to the document room. In addition to that I ordered printed, under the general leave the committee has to print, 500 more copies. So there ought to be 2,500 copies in the document room now.

Mr. MANN. Of all documents as ordered printed from the desk or ordered by the House, the "usual number" is printed, which is fourteen or fifteen hundred, and they are sent to the document room. There are also a proportion of them sent to the document room of the Senate, and there is set aside in the Printing Office a number equal to the membership of the House and Senate; in addition to that the copies that are sent to depositories in the country; and the Clerk, for the benefit of the House, orders extra copies printed where there is a great demand.

Mr. TALBOTT. I want to make this suggestion to the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course I desire to have the bill printed and to go through the document room or the folding room so that Members can get them, and I would like as fair a distribution among Members as possible; and that is the reason I introduced the resolution in this form.

Mr. TALBOTT. I would like to say—

Mr. PAYNE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not this bill was reported by the committee as originally introduced?

Mr. PAYNE. It was.

Mr. TALBOTT. I want to ask why not have it printed in the Record, showing the changes between the proposed law and the Dingley bill, and then we will have this bill and the Dingley bill side by side?

Mr. PAYNE. I do think they ought to be printed in the Record. We are having prepared, section by section, paragraph by paragraph, the Dingley bill with the corresponding paragraphs in this bill, and as soon as that is prepared I propose to ask the House to print a reasonable number of copies of that comparison.

Mr. TALBOTT. That will do what we want.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is right; that will suit the convenience of us all.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. It is not the gentleman's intention to have that put in the Record, is it?

Mr. PAYNE. Not to put the bill in the Record; no.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. No; the comparative tables.

Mr. PAYNE. I have no such intention as that. The House can regulate that matter when it is brought in here at a later date.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman whether in the publication now provided for there is any statement of the comparative rates or changes that are made by this bill when compared with the Dingley bill, or whether that is to be in a subsequent statement?

Mr. PAYNE. The report shows the changes made from the Dingley law, item by item. In addition to that, I stated to the House that the clerks of the committee are now making, paragraph by paragraph, a comparison of the Dingley bill and the proposed bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to state to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS] that time is so precious that it only took twelve minutes from the time the Ways and Means Committee got inside the room to report this bill back, and he could not reasonably expect—

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that the gentleman has no right in the House to state what took place in the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My understanding was that anybody could state what he pleased. It is already stated, anyhow. [Laughter.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I want to be heard now under a motion to reconsider the ruling. The gentleman from Missouri was not stating what occurred. He was stating the time of the occurrence. [Laughter.] I should like to have the rule read that prevents the stating of the time occupied by a committee in consideration or in failure to consider some matter. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] stated nothing that occurred.

Mr. OLMSTED. He was stating what occurred in twelve minutes.

Mr. MANN. He did say what occurred. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] is incorrect.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is already stated, anyhow, and you can not get it back.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that the gentleman from Missouri has stated that.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope now we can get unanimous consent to print.

Mr. DAWSON. Is it proposed to print this comparison as a House document or as a committee document?

Mr. PAYNE. As a House document. It is proposed to ask the House to print it when it is prepared.

Mr. DAWSON. In that case there will be plenty of available copies in the document room.

Mr. PAYNE. That is for the House to determine when that matter comes up. I want to say now that there are 500 copies of this bill in the document room, and I am informed that they are expecting 2,000 more copies inside of a few minutes, so that there will be 2,500 copies of the bill in the document room, aside

from those provided by the resolution to be sent to the folding room.

Mr. DAWSON. If this is printed as a House document, it will be available to every Member of the House?

Mr. PAYNE. We will cross that bridge when we come to it.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman's request contemplate placing any part of this publication in the document room?

Mr. PAYNE. It does not, but there are already 2,500 copies of the bill in the document room. Those printed under this resolution will all go to the folding room.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

THIRTEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration in the House, as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, of the bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union of a bill of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that we had better consider this in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana modify his request?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I modify my request, so as to cover that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana modifies his request, which now is that the bill be considered at this time under the rules of the House. Is there objection?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I think we had better proceed in the regular way, Mr. Speaker. Let us find out what the rules are now. I object.

Mr. HAY. I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection a moment.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Very well.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill is the same bill which was passed by the Sixtieth Congress, with no change in it except as to the appointment of clerks to be utilized in the Census Office. Am I correct about that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And striking out that provision respecting the printing of reports outside of the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HAY. I also understand that it is of vital importance that this bill be passed at as early a moment as practicable. I understand the rules of the House to be, so far as the consideration of this bill is concerned, the same as they were in the last Congress, and that if the request of the gentleman from Indiana is agreed to, the House will consider the bill in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; that the bill will be read for amendment, and, if necessary, that there will be time given for general debate. Under these circumstances I hope the gentleman from Missouri will not object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Nevertheless and notwithstanding, I think we had better take the regular order, and I object.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess for thirty minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 24.

Resolved, That immediately on the adoption hereof it shall be in order to consider, under the rules of the House, House bill 1033, a bill to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses.

Mr. DALZELL. On that I demand the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, as is well known, the time approaches when it is necessary to take a new census under the provisions of the Constitution. The Sixtieth Congress passed a bill providing for the taking of the census; it passed both Houses and went to the President, and was disapproved by the

President for two reasons: First, because of a provision contained in the bill with respect to appointments, and, second, with respect to a provision for printing. Now, the bill has been introduced as it passed the House, with the exception of these two provisions, and the proposition under the rule is that the House shall proceed to a consideration of that bill under the rules. In other words, that the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and consider the bill by general debate and by paragraph. That is all there is to it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman says that the only difference between this bill and the other bill is in the two provisions which he has named. Is there not another change with reference to the appointment of supervisors? The old bill provided that the supervisors should be appointed by the President, "by and with the consent of the Senate," and this bill leaves out the words "by and with the consent of the Senate."

Mr. DALZELL. That is one particular, I understand, in which the bill differs.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman said that there were only two changes, which he named—the appointment of clerks in the Census Office and the printing.

Mr. DALZELL. If I am mistaken, it will appear from the bill itself. The bill will be open for consideration under the five-minute rule and for unlimited amendment. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND].

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the necessity for the passage of a bill to regulate the taking of the next census. The bill in its present form could have been passed and approved by the President during the last Congress. There could have been an effort made to pass the old bill over the veto of the President. So the idea of urgency was not so great with the brethren then as it is now.

When I objected a few moments ago to this bill being taken up by unanimous consent, I confess that I had a desire to see the working of this old system, said to be made somewhat new. I have a desire to see wherein the new attachment affects the old machine, and how it operates. We are not so tremendously pressed for time now that there could not be a consideration of this bill in the ordinary and orderly way. Altogether this illustrates right well, it seems to me, the necessity for amendment of these rules with reference to the constitution and operation of the Committee on Rules.

There would have been no meeting of this committee called if the Speaker had not decided in advance that a rule like this should be reported. The committee was not assembled for consideration of this rule or anything else, but merely to give form and substance, in a technical way, under the rules, to the decree of the Speaker already rendered. There was no deliberation about it; and later there was simply an announcement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to the House of a decision previously arrived at by the Speaker. As to this particular matter, it is a question of choice in procedure between a resort to this rule and the appointment of a committee on the census, the reference of the bill to that committee, a report by that committee, and then the consideration of the bill in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union or in the House.

This shows the readiness with which the Committee on Rules is operated. Whenever anything may be a little difficult, whenever there may be a little obstruction anywhere, apply to the Committee on Rules! In other words, when the Speaker has decided to have something done, this Committee on Rules, of his own creation, is the orderly and very expeditious means resorted to for accomplishment in the House.

I am one of those who believe it would be a great improvement, one of lasting and far-reaching benefit, to have the Committee on Rules representative of the House and not representative merely of the Speaker of the House; have the Committee on Rules made by the selection of the Members of the House, and not made solely by the selection of the Speaker of the House, I suppose that no such thing ever happened as a member of the Committee on Rules, belonging to the party of the Speaker, voting in a meeting of that committee against the will and wish of the Speaker. I think no such thing ever happened, and I am sure no such thing ever will happen, so long as the committee is made up in the way in which it is now made up, by the agency, which makes it, the Speaker, whoever the Speaker may be.

This Committee on Rules, then, is not a representative body. It is not really a committee at all. It is an indirect way for the

Speaker to say to his party friends upon the floor, "I have decided to have this done, and I call upon you to do it." It would be the same thing in effect if the Speaker from his place in the Speaker's chair were to rise and announce that the Speaker had decided that this, that, or the other thing should be done, and that he called upon his party friends upon the floor to make effective his decision. It would be the same thing as if the Speaker were to vacate the chair temporarily, take his place upon the floor, and from the floor make the motion, calling upon the House to register approval of a decree already entered by him.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I will state that that was done in the Fifty-third Congress by Mr. Speaker Crisp.

Mr. DE ARMOND. It can be done very easily. That is certainly a more direct way of doing it than the method practiced in the Sixtieth Congress, and now inaugurated in the Sixty-first Congress. It does not make any difference who did it, or when it was done. The question remains the same: Ought the important Committee on Rules to be one chosen by the membership of the body representing it, or ought it to be one chosen by the Speaker of the House, with the Speaker its controlling member, and directly representing him? That is the direct question, no matter where it first arose, and no matter how it may have been determined some place, some time.

Here we have the first fruits, in this Congress, in this House, of the action of this committee. They have taken out of regular channels a bill, as it turns out in this particular instance, which easily could come before the House without their agency, and to which probably there is no particular objection; but what they have done with this bill is precisely what they can do with any other bill at any time.

Then, another thing. As this Committee on Rules now is, and always, I think, will be, made up merely to echo the sentiment and to voice the decrees of the Speaker, when made with rules such as we now have in force, so any and every committee in this House by operation of the present rules, even with the innocuous amendments put into them, can be made to report any particular measure or to suppress during the entire life of a Congress other measures along any line or any particular measure referred to the committee.

The rules heretofore and now put the House, the membership of the House, and the business of the House and legislation submitted to the House in the control of the Speaker. Now, then, without any reference to the personality of the gentleman who occupies the Speaker's chair, without any reference to any Speaker past or to come, these rules concentrate in the Speaker powers that belong to the House, and whatever powers are concentrated in the Speaker are powers taken from the membership of the House.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Vermont?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes, for a question. My time is short.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Does not the gentleman know that a Republican caucus elected the present Republican members of the Committee on Rules?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I heard that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. If, then, this plan works so badly, as he declares, as to the Committee on Rules, would he be in favor of extending the method to the selection of other committees?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, I think, already knows that I am very much in favor of extending the selection of committees so that every committee in the House may be selected by the House.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Why complain, then, of the membership of the Committee on Rules, selected in that way?

Mr. DE ARMOND. The gentleman does not seem to be able to appreciate the distinction between complaining and discussing a proposition. I understand this question to be a great and far-reaching and important question in American politics—one that goes to the very foundation of the organization and usefulness of the House of Representatives—that goes to the very source and mainspring of legislative life in these United States of America.

There can not be taken from the Members of the House of Representatives upon either side, from any Member, any right or any power which, under the Constitution and by virtue of his election, belongs to him without a wrong being done, not only to him and his constituency, but to the whole people of the United States, and a dangerous blow being struck at our institutions themselves. That is the reason that I am opposed to this one-man power. I am opposed to this concentration of power; I am opposed to this agency which operates to deprive

Members of what belongs to them and concentrates it somewhere else.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DE ARMOND. Now, if there be given time—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Vermont?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I thought my time had expired. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Is it not true that the Democratic caucus instructed the minority leader to name the Members of the various committees of the House?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Democratic caucus intrusted to the leader upon this side, as the gentleman knows and as the Speaker knows, and as the gentleman knew and as the Speaker knew, the matter of suggesting to the Speaker who would be satisfactory and who would not be satisfactory to this side, and it is also a matter of history that the Speaker, in the few appointments that he has announced, made selections not satisfactory to this side, without consulting anybody upon this side who had the right to be consulted about it at all, and misrepresented this side in his appointments and misrepresented the party—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes additional to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I will.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the gentleman mean to suggest that I have taken my place on the Committee on Ways and Means without the approval or consent of the minority leader?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the matter stands with reference to that. I did not have the gentleman particularly in mind. I am right well satisfied, however, that the gentleman was not selected with a view of carrying joy to this side of the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I am thoroughly satisfied that as to the selection of other gentlemen named by the Speaker, whatever the motive may have been, the thing that actuated the Speaker was not a desire to represent this side or the sentiment of this side in the selection of persons for committee places, or with reference to the questions to be dealt with. I am satisfied also that when the Speaker gave to this side 7 members of the important Committee on Ways and Means out of 19, when this side is entitled to at least 8, when he took 1 from this side and gave 1 to the other side, and when he put upon that committee, ostensibly from this side, men who did not and do not represent this side in sentiment or in anything else—that then the Speaker, not accidentally but by conscious act, illustrated to the House and to the country the dangerous possibilities of power concentrated in the Chair for the making up of committees for particular purposes, in view of particular considerations, without regard to the large body of Members of this House, and the large body of the people of the country, who do not receive proper consideration or representation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, of all the unreasonable kicks I have heard in previous Congresses from a similar locality the one just indulged is the most unreasonable. The House passed and the Senate passed during the last Congress the census bill, which was carefully considered for months in the Committee on the Census and was carefully considered in both Houses of Congress. For reasons satisfactory to the Executive, he vetoed that bill. Now, we come up with this same bill, agreed to in this manner by both Houses, eliminating the features that were objectionable to the Executive, and want to pass it. It must be passed, as the commencing of the taking of the census is only a few months off. We have met here in extra session for the purpose of revising the tariff. The bill has been reported. We propose to have it read this week and at the earliest moment possible—and gentlemen have been actively engaged for the last six months working upon that bill—take it up for discussion on Monday next. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] comes in here this morning and asks unanimous consent to consider this bill. Objection is made. There is no alternative except to let the bill go over and not pass it, or to bring in a rule simply to consider it in the Committee of the Whole—

Mr. DE ARMOND. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I have not time to yield now. (Continuing.) To consider it in the Committee of the Whole, where every opportunity will be given for amendment. Now the gentleman drags in here a personal attack upon the Speaker of this House, trying to carry on the lost battle of Monday last.

He criticises the appointment of the Committee on Rules; and yet the Republican caucus led the way, suggesting to the Speaker two members of the Committee on Rules, members approved by solid vote in that caucus, to be appointed by the Speaker. There have been several Democratic caucuses since. How have they responded to that invitation? They bicker among themselves; they try to discipline members of their party; but what response has there been made to the invitation of the Republican caucus? Not a sign. But they go on and declare that no man shall serve on the minority side of the committees unless he is approved by whom? A man selected by the House? No. Why, they come down immediately from their committee of fifteen and select one man in their own party [applause on the Republican side], saying that no man on their side of the House shall dare to serve on a committee, although appointed by the Speaker of the House, under the rules of the House, without being put under the Democratic ban. I think there are some men in the House left on that side who have manhood enough and enough sense of responsibility to their constituents—yes, and a regard for the oath that they took when they entered this Congress to well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which they were about to enter—to serve upon the committees of the House unless excused by the House. I do not think that the Members on that side of the House have become so servile that they will yield to this imperious demand that comes to them, and even violate the oath of their office by refusing to serve on the committees of the House when properly and constitutionally under the rules of the House appointed to serve upon the committees of the House. And yet that is what you are trying to do. That is your attitude. You are trying to turn away from the folly of your committee of fifteen and concentrate the whole power on that side into the hands of one man, who was not selected by the House, but by the caucus on your side of the House. Talk about your one-man power! What explanation have you to make of that? Oh, my friend from Missouri thinks it is proper just now to denounce the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield as much more time as the gentleman wants.

Mr. PAYNE. They denounce the rules of the House and denounce the Committee on Rules, and yet without this committee now it would be impossible for a majority of the House, however much they favored this bill, to get consideration of it. No; it would be impossible with 390 Members in favor of this bill to get consideration of it against the inconsiderate folly that comes from one Member on that side of the House.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I will yield for a question.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I wish just to suggest to the gentleman that that tremendous difficulty could be avoided by the appointment of a Committee on the Census. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. We might appoint all the committees of the House.

Mr. DE ARMOND. No; the Committee on the Census.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman from Missouri accept an appointment on the Committee on the Census if one were appointed?

Mr. PAYNE. It has been the general consensus of opinion on both sides of the House that only certain committees—the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Accounts, the Committee on Printing, and the Committee on Ways and Means—should be appointed, in order not to retard the consideration of the tariff bill. Fortunately the House has a committee, when 390 Members want a vote on a bill, that will prevent the factious objection of one man, a tyrannical one-man power by a man not chosen by a caucus even, without any more power than any other Member of the House.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Chosen by the people.

Mr. PAYNE (continuing). We are proceeding in the orderly manner of business, determining by a vote of the majority of the House whether we want to consider this bill, and not indulging in carping criticism and abuse of the honorable gentleman who is the Speaker of this House, the peer of any Member of this House [loud applause on the Republican side], equal in integrity, in character, in fairness, with any who sits here or have sat here during my service of twenty-four years. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How much more time is there, Mr. Speaker, on either side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has ten minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri has seven minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think you can go on and use some more of your time.

Mr. DALZELL. You have only had one speech; go ahead, now, and make another. I want to hear it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You will hear it whether you want to hear it or not, if you are within a half a mile's distance. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is always amusing when he enters upon the rôle of lecturer of this House, and the madder he gets the more amusing he becomes. I do not care anything about the eulogy that he passed upon the Speaker. It has nothing to do with it. I will tell you what I think about the Committee on Rules; and it will only take one or two sentences to do it. As long as the Committee on Rules is appointed by the Speaker and the Speaker is the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the Speaker is the Committee on Rules. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He is the whole thing. Now, so much for that. I am opposed to that system. I do not believe that the Speaker of the House ought to be a member of the Committee on Rules [applause on the Democratic side], and I will tell you why.

The Speaker is the leader of his party in the House. The minority leader is supposed to be the leader of the minority. The Speaker and the minority leader are pitted against each other, and the Speaker has the determining voice as to who wins the victory. Now, if Jack Johnson and Jim Jeffries have a prize fight, nobody would suppose that either Jim Jeffries or Jack Johnson ought to be the referee in that fight, would they? [Laughter.]

I say very frankly, and always have said, that if this House in a Republican administration is to have a czar, I would just as lief the present occupant of the chair was the czar as anybody else. He is a sort of benevolent despot. [Laughter.]

Now, one other word in that direction. I never knew, Mr. Speaker, that the Republican caucus had elected two members on the Committee on Rules until I heard it, I suppose it must have been, Tuesday. I had not read the proceedings of the Republican caucus.

Mr. MANN. And you were not present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And I was not there; I am sorry I was not, when they passed that resolution. I never was informed of it; never. We never had an opportunity to elect two on our side.

It seems to me that it is a very poor pretense for the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to undertake to say that we are opposed to electing committees when that was the very thing we were making the fight for on Monday, and we had the machine of this House flat on its back for three hours. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] Now, that is the truth about it.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Did you remain on top?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We were on top for three hours. [Laughter.] And everybody knows why we did not stay on top. [Great laughter.] Now, one other thing: The gentleman spoke about the Democratic caucus passing a resolution that a Democrat should not serve on these committees unless I "viséed" his appointment, as they say in French, or "O. K.'ed" it. I viséed Mr. HARRISON's appointment by reason of the fact that he acted the man and came into the Democratic caucus and gave back to us his appointment to that committee. [Great applause.] So much for that.

I say this about these committees: That the Republicans in some way ought to make up their side of the committees and the Democratic side in some way ought to make up their side of the committees. In that way each side would undertake to get men placed on the committee that represented their side to the best advantage and where they could do the most valuable work. I am not complaining that the Speaker has resumed the powers that he originally had; but I do say that there are two political committees in this House, and only two. One of them is the Committee on Rules, the other is the Committee on Ways and Means; and if there are any two committees in the House in which the men ought to be Republicans, on one side, who will stand hitched, or Democrats, on the other side, who will stand hitched, it is on the Committee on Rules and on the Ways and Means Committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If we had had the opportunity we would have elected all of the Democratic members on all of the committees, and that is my fight. It has just begun; and I do not have a particle of doubt about the ultimate triumph of our cause in that direction, and neither do you.

Mr. MANN. No; we do not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Not a bit; if you have any sense you do not.

Now, one other thing about this census bill, of course everybody knows that the census bill has to be passed; that is, that it ought to be.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] has suggested a way out of this, instead of bringing into operation this juggernaut machine called the "Rules Committee," and that is by appointing the Committee on Census and doing things in order. But here is the situation: This House, after ample debate and due deliberation, passed a census bill. The Senate passed it, and President Roosevelt, in the exercise of his power, vetoed it, and when the veto came back over here the fighting qualities of the Republican side flamed up, and the tip went around that if we would stand with them they would override the President's veto. That was the first day; but after a little time for reflection the Republicans' courage, like that of Bob Acres, oozed out. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] And although the man who was wielding the "big stick" was about to go out of the White House, they were afraid they would get one more crack on the head with that weapon, so they ignominiously backed down, and here you are with the bill back here now. You had plenty of time to pass it in the last session, but you were afraid to. Half of you over there in the last two weeks of the last Congress trembled in your boots constantly for fear President Roosevelt would send in a blood and thunder message that would arouse the country against you, as he had done once or twice before. That is the situation about the whole business. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] occupied all his time?

The SPEAKER. His time has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield the balance of my time to my colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has ten minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules originated early in American history.

From the First Congress, in 1789, there has always been a Committee on Rules, but it was for many years simply a select committee authorized at the beginning of each Congress to report a system of rules. In 1841 it was decided that the committee, which was still a select committee, might report from time to time. At first the Speaker was not a member of the committee, but on June 14, 1858, a resolution was agreed to authorizing the appointment of a committee on rules, of whom the Speaker was to be one, to revise the rules and report at the next session. The committee continued to be a select committee until the revision of 1890, when it was made a standing committee, with its membership fixed at five, in accordance with the previous usage. In 1891 the right to report at any time was conferred upon the committee, and in 1893 it was given the right to sit during sessions of the House.

I read from Hinds's Parliamentary Precedents. It thus appears that it was a Democratic Congress in 1880 that first created this Committee on Rules as a standing, as distinguished from a select, committee of the House. [Applause on the Republican side.] It has always been chosen, under Democratic administrations of the House, by the Speaker of the House. But the Republican party, recognizing a popular demand, whether based upon full information or not, for a change, determined to make this committee not one selected by another committee, a mere oligarchy, but to make this a committee selected by the House itself, every Republican member selected by the Republican caucus, and every Democratic member selected by the Democratic caucus. It passed a resolution to that effect on Saturday night. That was printed in three daily papers in the city of Washington on Sunday, and yet it is claimed that no information of it got to the Democratic side of the House until after Monday. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Why did not the Speaker inform the Democratic leader that he was waiting for the announcement of the Democratic Members?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Oh, the gentlemen were advised by the public prints, and they will not claim that none of them read the daily papers at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But we were not advised, and we did not know of it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Now, what is the fact? The Democratic party met in caucus on Monday at 10 o'clock, the day after this notice had been published in three Washington dailies, and selected no one for this committee. It met again on the

afternoon of that day and selected no one for this committee. The rules commanded the Speaker to appoint the Committee on Rules, and when the time came he appointed the committee strictly in accordance with the rules of the House, appointing those Members chosen by the Republican caucus, and selecting men for the Democratic side, the Democratic caucus having failed to act.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do not think I care to yield; I have only a short time.

Mr. JAMES. I would not either, on that line.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman from Kentucky need not be disturbed, but in my short time I do not care to yield. Now, what is the fact? That side of the House proposed to appoint a committee to select the members of the Committee on Rules, and we adopted the policy that the House itself should select the members. The Members on this side selected our members, and the Members on that side were authorized to select their members.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Very well.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is a good thing now for the Republican party to select two members of the Committee on Rules, why don't you go the whole hog and select the whole?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There are about a thousand appointments to be made on all the committees of this House, and no intelligent man will claim that it is possible for this body of 400 people to make a thousand separate selections of Members on committees. Now, the gentleman from Missouri recognized that when he proposed a committee on committees in place of the election of the committee in the body of the House—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. One more question.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. My time is rapidly passing and I must proceed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How do you reconcile the action of the caucus and the selection of two members with the repeated declarations of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am not responsible for the declarations of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (continuing). That the old code of rules was the most perfect ever devised by the will of man?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; but he never declared that it was the most perfect that ever could be devised by the will of man. [Laughter on the Republican side.] The truth is that these gentlemen were so busy preparing to chasten certain gentlemen upon their side of the House in their caucus in the evening that they forgot to name the members of the Committee on Rules. [Laughter on the Republican side.] "Rebels in Cork are patriots at Madrid." [Laughter.]

The Committee on Rules has no power to force any rule upon this House; it has simply the power to bring measures before the House, and unless the majority favor the action of that committee its action is null. So that all the Committee on Rules can do is to give the majority an opportunity to vote.

We have heard a good deal of talk lately, Mr. Speaker, about the inability to compel committees to report, and about the helpless character of the House when committees do not report; but here is a proposition to bring a bill before the House that has previously been considered by the committee of another Congress and let the House itself, in its aggregate capacity, determine every question as to the census. Oh, but the gentleman says, why not appoint a Committee on Census? I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when the gentleman from Missouri brought in his resolution the other day it provided that the Speaker was authorized to appoint certain specific committees, revoked his authority to appoint all the other committees, and left the Census Committee off the list that he was going to permit the Speaker to appoint at this session of Congress. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are we operating under the rule that I brought in or under something else? What do you say about that? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman declared his hostility to the appointment of a Committee on Census at this session of Congress, and sought to prohibit the Speaker from doing so, and now when we yield to that suggestion that no Committee on the Census shall be appointed we are again arraigned for arbitrary conduct in trying to carry out even his plan and purpose in this small way. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was considered, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MANN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, this bill, in most of its aspects, is identically the same as the bill that passed both Houses late in the last Congress and was disapproved by the President. The original bill was discussed in the House for four or five days, and after thorough consideration in the Senate it was amended somewhat and was agreed to in conference. The President pointed out one material objection to the bill. That related to the manner of the appointment of clerks in the Census Office in this city.

It was the purpose of the Congress in enacting the bill in the first place to confer upon the Director of the Census a very wide latitude of discretion all along the line, and that large discretion was embodied in the provision for the appointment of clerks as well as in all other provisions of the bill. The work of taking a decennial census is a gigantic task. It is largely emergency work. There are three chief considerations to be observed in the preparation of a census law.

The first, and prime one, perhaps, is the accuracy of the work, and second, its dispatch, and the third, economy in the administration of the work. In order that these things may be accomplished, experience has shown that it is imperatively necessary that the man at the head of this great undertaking shall have a free hand in relation to most of the administrative matters, so that he can meet and settle exigencies as they arise with the least possible delay; and that explains, Mr. Chairman, the reason why the Congress incorporated in the first bill the provision respecting the appointment of clerks. It was an attempt to adapt the merit system to the peculiar character of the work during the temporary period in the Census Office.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman believe that under the bill as it is now prepared the Director of the Census, on whose shoulders rests its accuracy, will have as full and complete a hand as he had under the bill which passed the Sixtieth Congress?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No; the Director of the Census under the pending bill does not have as much latitude, his power is somewhat circumscribed, and that provision was changed to meet the objection made by the President in disapproving the bill. But allow me to say this: The provision is so framed as to still confer upon the Director of the Census all the latitude, all the liberty, he may require for the welfare of the service, because it does provide that when exigencies arise he may select clerks from the eligible list upon other considerations than the ground of rating; but to meet exigencies only.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. The eligible lists of what?

Mr. LANGLEY. The Civil Service Commission has nothing to do with the appointments.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, I beg pardon; I should be cross-examined by only one counsel at a time. I am yielding now to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to cross-examine the gentleman, but to get the gentleman's knowledge, having made the former admission that the gentleman has made, whether or not it is a fact that he does believe that if this bill passes and becomes a law as it is now prepared it will strike a blow at the accuracy of the Thirteenth Census.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, I do not. I am willing to confess that in our attempt to secure to the Director of the Census full control over the work, we conferred upon him a latitude that was not necessary. We gave him more liberty in making appointments than was required for the proper administration of the service, and in this provision we have specified the manner of appointments, the policy of appointment, and saved to him expressly simply that latitude that may be necessary for the proper administration of the work.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is there not danger, if the bill as it is now prepared passes, of a conflict occurring between the Director of the Census and the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think not.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Suppose the director comes to the conclusion that an exigency exists whereby he ought to employ certain people; under the bill as it is now prepared does the gentleman believe that the Director of the Census would have the power, over the opposition of the Civil Service Commission, to appoint anybody?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The bill provides that there shall be a special test examination, the character of which shall be determined by the Director of the Census, the examination to be conducted by the Civil Service Commission, equipped with the official mechanism to conduct such examinations, and that the examinations shall be open to everybody, without regard to political party affiliations. It does require the Civil Service Commission to certify the whole list of eligibles over to the Director of the Census, with all the examination papers. The Director of the Census then is the custodian of the entire eligible roll, and the bill provides that the clerks shall be selected without regard to the rule of geographical apportionment; but the director must give preference in order of rating, excepting when the exigencies of the service may require it he may give preference in order of location or other conditions to secure clerks who are immediately available. There can be no conflict.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Under the bill, if the eligible list is certified over to the director, is he not compelled to accept it?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. So it takes away to that extent any discretion in the Director of the Census altogether?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No, no. I think the gentleman misunderstands the situation. I yield now to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, on pages 4 and 5 of the bill the entire force is put under the civil service, and on page 5, line 4, I find these words:

Without regard to the law of apportionment.

Now, if the gentleman will permit, my understanding of the civil-service law now is that the law of apportionment applies to the different localities in the United States; so that even if some of the applicants living near the seat of government stand higher than those at a farther distance, if those localities near the capital have their full quota they would have to wait until other localities in the United States had received their quota before they would take precedence over those at a distance.

Now, I would like to ask the gentleman why, in putting this under civil service—which to my mind is an almighty bad thing, but conceding we have got to take it—why it was that the localities represented by gentlemen in the Mississippi Valley are virtually prohibited from any possibility of being employed on this temporary force?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think the gentleman from Iowa misunderstands the force or the meaning of that provision. In the first place—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Then, let me make myself a little clearer—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think I understand the gentleman—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. You provide here that the selection made by the Civil Service Commission shall be certified over to the Director of the Census, and the Director of the Census must make his selection without regard to the law of apportionment in the order of rating—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Now, that is a change of the civil-service law—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa (continuing). Making it still worse on parties representing constituents at some distance from the seat of government.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And that recommendation was made by a special committee appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor, at the head of which was Carroll D. Wright, specially recommending the abolition of the rule of geographical apportionment, and the President, in his message of disapproval to this bill, especially—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER (continuing). Especially referred to that fact and said it ought to be left out of the bill, and the Director of the Census, who perhaps knows more about census work and the official requirements than any other man in the

country, asked to have it left out. Now, these are the witnesses—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes; but why should it be left out?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. These are the witnesses who have testified it should be left out.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. But why?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. For the good of the service. Now, the object of leaving it out is to avoid the difficulties that might be met, as the gentleman remembers, in following the rule of geographical apportionment. Suppose, now, as the gentleman states, those States within a hundred or two hundred miles of the city of Washington have their full quota or more. Suppose we adhere to the rule of geographical apportionment. Then, of course the remote States are the only ones which could furnish clerks in the temporary service, and the gentleman must bear in mind this service is only temporary—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I know that.

Mr. CRUMPACKER (continuing). And the average tenure will not perhaps be to exceed two years and the pay is from \$600 to \$1,000 a year, and under the rule of geographical apportionment the Director of the Census would be compelled to go to California and other remote States for the clerks. He would have to keep a large number of clerks on hand on the waiting list, on the pay roll, to meet emergencies, so that the application of that rule would be costly and embarrassing.

This bill was drawn with the view of avoiding unnecessary "red tapism," a thing that strangled and destroyed the value of the census taken in 1890. If we preserve all the requirements that are applicable to the permanent service we will surround the Census Office again with these red-tape requirements that will greatly impair the value of this great work, and greatly increase its cost. Rather than do that we had better not have the work done and save the money in the Treasury.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, it seems to me, does not give very much weight to the language of the bill a little farther down, which provides that—

when the exigencies of the service require, preference may be given to eligibles who by reason of residence or other conditions are immediately available.

If that language means anything, it means in case of emergency and the States far off have not their quota they can take them from near here—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Surely.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. And if you put it as you have, in my judgment you simply give notice to Illinois and Iowa and Nebraska and other States of the West that—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me answer at this point that I think the gentleman has business judgment enough to appreciate the importance of doing business in a business way, and doubtless realizes the fact that the work in the Census Office during the decennial period is not ordinary administrative work.

It can not suffer the ordinary delays. Now, leaving the provision in the bill, abrogating the rule of geographic apportionment, and retaining the requirement that gives preference in order of rating, we have a kind of apportionment not based upon geography, but upon rating, and we require the safety provision in the bill under any circumstances.

Now, another thing. These examinations will be held all over the country, I have no doubt, and all those on the eligible list will be certified, and the Director of the Census can foresee that he will require, say, a hundred, five hundred, or a thousand clerks in a week or ten days or two weeks, as the case may be. He will pick them out. He will notify the availables in the gentleman's district, in the State of Iowa, in the State of California, and other remote States, as they come, to be here in due time. It will be done in that way, excepting when something arises that has not been foreseen that requires the immediate appointment of clerks, then we give him the right to appoint from the eligible roll upon considerations of availability.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. If the gentleman will let me have three or four minutes, he can answer me fully, and I will not delay any longer.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman wants to make a speech?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not want to make a speech. If I did I would want more time. I want to make an explanation of my position, not in the form of a question, and the gentleman can answer it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] to make his statement.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I only want four minutes, and would like to have that time entirely to myself.

Under the last census, and the one taken before that, the director made up the list of all his force on the recommenda-

tion of Members of Congress, but only selecting those who could pass a prescribed test examination. That made it nonpartisan. To my mind that was a true merit system.

Mr. HAY. Noncompetitive.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Noncompetitive; but the applicant for appointment had to pass a test examination, and all who failed to pass that examination and show their ability to do that work were rejected by the Director of the Census. To my mind that was the merit system in a greater degree than the civil-service system. The civil service will load up here in the neighborhood of 4,000 employees, and when this is completed, no matter what you put in the bill now, every pressure on earth will be brought to bear to provide places for them, on the ground that they ought to stand equally with every other man in the civil service. The other men were taken from different localities and were appointed, if they passed a test examination, and probably some of them came here from a distance. Do you propose in this bill—and I am not objecting to the civil-service provision in the bill, as I would be glad to get rid of the responsibility of naming anybody for any place—to give no man in a distant State notice that he can get an appointment, but notify him that he has to pass higher than the other fellow on the list or he can not get an appointment?

Some of the very best men in the last census, as the Director of the Census, who took the census then, will testify, were men who had not the best of scholastic ability, but had practical ability, and did their work in such a manner that they received promotion sooner than many of the men who passed a higher examination than they did. That is true.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I would like for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] to do as chairman of this committee, is not to waive all the rights of all the States distant from the capital, but arrange it so that you can have a merit system, so that every man that gets a place must pass a prescribed examination, and demonstrate by that his ability to do the work. Then let it be distributed among all the congressional districts of the United States, and let some man outside this locality have some chance to work for the Government some time during his life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

To whom does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] now yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have not made my selection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] first.

Mr. PADGETT. I would like to call the gentleman's attention, beginning with the proviso on line 5, page 5:

Provided, however, That when the exigencies of the service require, preference may be given to eligibles who by reason of residence or other conditions are immediately available.

Especially to the words, "or other conditions," and to submit this question: Suppose that a man with the highest rating lived in New York State and a man with a lower rating, but with a good political pull, is with his Congressman here at the time in the city of Washington. Are not "other conditions" thus presented under this law that would give preference over the man with the better rating in the State of New York, who might be had the day after to-morrow? That is to say, a condition that would make him immediately available.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That interpretation could be put upon the provision, but the object of the provision, if the gentleman will allow me to explain—

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The object of the provision is written clearly on its face. When any considerable discretion is vested in a public officer for the public good, it is liable to be abused. The most benevolent, the most necessary discretion, the great judicial discretion that is reposed in the courts of the country is liable to be abused every day. The purpose of the provision is written as clearly and as plainly as it could be. And let me say this: That identical provision is in the present civil-service law where appointments are made for temporary service. The Civil Service Commission can give preference in cases of emergencies on account of residence and other conditions, which makes eligibles immediately available.

Now, here is the proposition we had in mind: Suppose an eligible lived in Nebraska and happened to be here. The Director of the Census, if the exigency justified, could appoint that eligible without respect to his relative grade, as the condition of his being here would make him immediately available. Any condition that makes a man on the eligible list immediately available would come under the provision. The gentleman must bear this in mind. The applicant must pass the examination.

That is the condition of the applicant, and nobody will have his name placed on the register until he has demonstrated his fitness, his efficiency. We have safeguarded this provision as fully as we could safeguard any provision in respect to administration and carry out its purpose.

Mr. PADGETT. May I ask this further question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman may.

Mr. PADGETT. The provision in the civil-service law for selections to be placed on the temporary list is limited to sixty days' employment?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. This service is temporary.

Mr. PADGETT. This will be for two years or more.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Now a further question. In the line above you insert the words "without regard to the law of apportionment," eliminating that provision of the civil-service law, and then incorporate the words "or other conditions;" do you not make the provision thereby broad enough to bring in a whole freight train loaded with men that can be here in the city of Washington, and the only condition of appointment will be that they have passed an examination, are on the list, and in the city of Washington?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think the gentleman is hypercritical in his objections. He is imagining and dreaming things that are not at all likely to occur. As I said a moment ago, all discretionary power is liable to be abused. If there is any abuse of this discretion, it will come through the Director of the Census, an executive officer appointed by the President and to be removed by the President.

Can we find a safer agent in whom to vest this discretion than a man whose character and reputation are such that he has been appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to be Director of the Census? I have faith enough in human nature to believe we can trust such an officer.

Mr. PADGETT. One more question, and in good humor. The gentleman, I understood, in answering the gentleman from Iowa a while ago, stated that the Director of the Census would notify the eligibles from the States of Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, and California. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would notify them also from Tennessee, Alabama, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Texas?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, now, I do not know. That is a problem I am not able to answer.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the question I want to get at—when you eliminate the law of apportionment.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I regard the gentleman's question as a little bit of pleasantries, and not as a serious one.

Mr. PADGETT. I stated it pleasantly for the purpose of illustrating the effect of the elimination of the law of apportionment.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand the gentleman by his course of questions is discrediting the integrity of the present Director of the Census, or any other man who may be chosen to administer that office. I have more faith in human nature than the gentleman from Tennessee seems to have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a question, and then I would like to explain the bill. If the gentlemen would allow me to proceed with my explanation, I will cover these questions in one-fourth the time it is taking now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to ask one question apropos of what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] has said and of what the gentleman from Indiana has just said. What authority has the gentleman from Indiana from the Director of the Census to say that the director will proceed impartially with reference to this clause which strikes out the law of apportionment? What authority has the gentleman for saying that the director will do what I know he has not done in certain instances in the past; that is, give a chance to those who are away from here as well as those who are here and bringing local pressure to bear?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The Director of the Census has never said to me that he would be honest. He has never said to me that he would regard his oath of office; but—

Mr. DOUGLAS. He does not have to be honest, under this provision.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. But the gentleman from Ohio knows, or at least he ought to know from the history of this legislation, that these provisions must be incorporated into the bill or we will have no satisfactory census.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That will be the practical effect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We will have a census all right, but we will

have it taken under the most arbitrary method of administration.

Mr. HAY. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Indiana to the provision for the appointment of supervisors. On page 9, line 25, it is provided that—

The supervisors shall be appointed by the President.

In the bill which was passed by this House in the last Congress it was provided that the supervisors should be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and I should like to know why that was left out of this bill. And would the gentleman object to an amendment at the proper time to reinsert those words, which will be inserted by the Senate anyway, as they were inserted during the last Congress?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, I do not know. That was stricken out, and if the gentleman desires, when the time comes, to move to amend it, he will have that opportunity. He understands the force and effect of that as well as I do, and there will be an opportunity given to move to restore the provision requiring confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman's sole argument so far has been based upon the constant assertion that a very wide discretion is needed in regard to appointments. Now, a lot of us would like to know the reason for that discretion, rather than the constant assertion that it ought to be there. Practically this bill gives a discretion so wide as to make the civil-service features of it negligible. Now, if that be necessary, then all right; but instead of the assertion as to the necessity, will the gentleman give us the reason for it?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. In the first place, the gentleman assumes a proposition that I do not think is based on fact, because the bill does not grant any such latitude. There is only one element of discretion, and that is where exigencies may arise—

Mr. SHERLEY. Of which the Director of the Census is the sole judge.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Of course.

Mr. SHERLEY. And it does away with the law of apportionment.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Of course the discretion is exercised by the director, and it is just like a judge of a court in granting an injunction or exercising any other discretion. There must be an exercise of discretion in the administrative service.

Mr. SHERLEY. You would hardly put the Director of the Census on the same plane as the judge of a court.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is an administrative discretion, and the gentleman is familiar with matters of administration, and knows that it is necessary in every administrative bureau to provide for it.

Mr. SHERLEY. And it is more frequently abused than exercised properly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is the reason we have circumscribed and safeguarded it as much as possible.

Mr. SHERLEY. Where is the circumscription, and where is the safeguarding?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have talked about this matter in the House and to the House until it has come to be an old story with me. Now, this work, as I have said, is emergency work all the way through. It is not necessary for me to go on and explain in detail why it is emergency work or repeat what its character is in detail. In the first place, the Director of the Census is the commander in chief of an army of 65,000 people in the field making schedules, enumerating the population, and obtaining statistics of manufactures. Schedules will come in by the million. More than 150,000,000 separate schedules will come in. Nobody can tell how rapidly they may come. The director may, in the exercise of his judgment, appoint 500 or 1,000 or 1,500 clerks, and conclude he has enough for a time. A flood of schedules may come into the office, many more than he anticipated, and he may need four or five hundred more clerks at once.

If he is bound by the merit system absolutely, under these circumstances it may require him three weeks to get the clerks. The object of this provision is to give him the power under such circumstances to select the clerks immediately available. Exigencies do arise. In the hearings before the House Census Committee Governor Merriam, director of the last census, stated that questions came up every day to be met and solved immediately, and he said it was absolutely necessary to give the director a free hand if the country expects him to do an accurate and economical piece of work. It is necessary, in view of the character of the work, to adapt the merit system to the particular service and not sacrifice the substance to the form.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then why tie him up at all?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, I think I have said all I care to on the emergency nature of the service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the bill was first under consideration certain gentlemen who advocated the selection of employees under the civil service did not believe it should extend to messenger boys, watchmen, unskilled labor, and charwomen. To my mind, I can see no necessity whatever in subjecting charwomen and unskilled labor to the civil-service requirements of this bill, especially for a temporary employment, and I would like to ask if the gentleman would have any objection to inserting an amendment in the proper place excepting that character of employees from the purview of the civil-service rule?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not feel at liberty to consent to accept any such amendment, and I would not have the power to accept any such amendment if I would. I submitted an appointment provision to several gentlemen interested in the matter and it met with their approval.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman believe that there is any necessity for bringing charwomen and messenger boys and unskilled labor under the requirement of the civil service?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I may not, but if we are to be hypercritical about it we might as well stop; if we are to bicker over every little immaterial provision which is not vital at all, we can not get a bill through, and I do not think this is a matter of sufficient importance.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give us any idea of the number of employees that would be needed for that service?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know; nobody can tell; not a great many, I imagine.

Mr. STAFFORD. I had no intention of bickering.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I know; but it is one of that class of questions that is not material.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to take exception to that remark, because those who favored the civil-service examination when this bill was up before did not embody that in their recommendation.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The only request that was made, and I think the one which the gentleman from Wisconsin supported himself—it may be that it included others—was changing the word "noncompetitive" to "competitive."

Mr. STAFFORD. The record will show that we excepted those employees from the civil-service examination.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, and then I must decline to yield any further.

Mr. CANDLER. Under this bill there are three classes who are to be selected, beginning on page 4 of the bill, from the eligible list, and in the second class are those that may be selected on emergencies upon their previous record in the Census Bureau. Then there is a third class of employees in other branches of the classified service who have had previous experience who may be transferred to the Census Office and service during the whole or a part of the census period.

Now, then, when you do away with the law of apportionment and then provide these three classes from which the employees may be obtained, could they not all be obtained in and around Washington and within a limited space of the city?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think not. I undertook to explain to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] a moment ago that examinations will be held all over the country, and the eligible list will be sent to the Director of the Census; and he can foresee, in a large measure, the number of clerks that will be required, and they will be selected from Mississippi or Indiana, or wherever it may be. This is the spirit of the bill; but where some matter arises that can not reasonably be foreseen, some contingency that must be met immediately, we give the director the other power to meet it, and that is all there is to the provision.

Mr. CANDLER. Can the gentleman say how many there are in the classified force that have had experience in the taking of the census heretofore?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Perhaps 300 or 400, scattered about through the country. It may be there are more that may be available—some in Washington, some in Mississippi, some in Indiana—scattered all over the country. Clerks that have records of efficiency in the office would be eligible without an examination at all, at the discretion of the Director of the Census.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does not the gentleman recall the fact that the Director of the Census stated that if we ignored the law

of apportionment a large majority of these clerks would come from the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. He may have made that statement.

Mr. HAMLIN. Did he not suggest that would not be a bad idea, because it was a temporary service?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Well, now, does the gentleman think it would be a good idea to ignore the law of apportionment and cut off the States that are not very proximate to the city of Washington?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will say this to my friend: This is public business. The census is not for the benefit of the officeholder or office seeker. It is public business. Now, I do not believe Congress would be justified in making any material sacrifice of the public business, involving considerable unnecessary expenditure of money, simply for the purpose of distributing these small appointments according to an arithmetical ratio amongst the States. I think the first consideration is to get satisfactory results.

Mr. HAMLIN. What additional expense would there be?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, if I have talked to any purpose at all, it has been to show that it is necessary to have clerks at hand, so as to meet every exigency as it arises, and you can not do that and have your clerks in Oregon and California when you need them to-day or to-morrow. If that should be done, the director will have to keep a large waiting list on the roll at public expense, so as to avoid the embarrassment that may come from such emergencies as that. I think I have explained that as far as I can. If that is not satisfactory, I can not make it satisfactory.

Mr. HAMLIN. If the gentleman will permit just one more question: Is it not contemplated that these examinations will be held in advance of this work?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Most certainly.

Mr. HAMLIN. And the eligible list made up?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Most certainly.

Mr. HAMLIN. Could they not be notified if they lived in Illinois or Missouri or in Indiana in time to reach here without any expense to the Government?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I have gone over this same proposition four or five times to-day in answer to questions very similar to that, and shown that the eligible list would be established and be in the office of the Director of the Census, and he could foresee in a general way when he would need clerks, and he would make selections in accordance with the law, make selections from the States that were entitled to the selections; but this discretion was given to cover a case when some exigency might arise requiring an immediate selection of clerks that he could not foresee. That is the third time, I am sure, that I have explained it.

Mr. HAMLIN. I understand that, but I understand that under this bill there is no requirement that the director shall go to any of these other States for any of these clerks.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Except on the question of rating. We have a right to presume that the rating will be as good in one State as in another, and clerks will be selected according to the same rule from Missouri that they will be selected in the States of New York and Virginia or the District of Columbia.

Mr. HAMLIN. But there is no assurance that there will be any examinations held anywhere except in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The examination is to be general and conducted by the Civil Service Commission and will be open to all applicants, without regard to sex or to political party affiliations. Will not that require them to be general? The Civil Service Commission has examining offices all over this country.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Is there any provision in this law that requires these examinations to be made anywhere else except at Washington?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There is no provision requiring them to be held at Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Then, may not all of them be required to be held here by the commission?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly not. Is there any provision in the law requiring other examinations to be held outside of the District? And yet the Civil Service Commission holds them all over the country.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Suppose the position of the chairman is correct, that they will be held wherever the Civil Service Commission wants them, is it not true that there will be on the eligible list for appointment persons from every State in the Union?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I presume so.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. And if that is true, why should the discretion be put in the Director of the Census to select, as the

gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] has suggested, from the District of Columbia or the territory contiguous thereto as the Director of the Census may see fit?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me ask the gentleman a question, as a business proposition. Here is this Census Office, with two or three or four thousand clerks, and a great volume of work coming in. There are eligibles around here and there immediately available, and some exigency arises that requires the immediate appointment of more clerks, and suppose they should be in Kansas or Missouri, all of them. What would the gentleman do? Allow the public business to be delayed in order to get the clerks from Kansas when others just as good are at hand?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. That is the very thing that the Members of this House are objecting to, to permitting the Director of the Census to have the discretion so that he may abuse that.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. So the gentleman from Kansas would take the discretion entirely away from him.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. No; the gentleman from Kansas would not do that at all, but the gentleman from Kansas would insist that the people from that State who are upon the eligible list are just as capable and competent and efficient for doing high-grade work as persons in the District of Columbia or from the State of Maryland.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At least they ought to have the chance to come here and be appointed.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I infer from the character of this discussion that the President's message vetoing the other bill was somewhat justified; that the desire is more in the line of getting jobs than in providing for the government work. The question, in my judgment, is how can we best accomplish the work that we are providing.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Why not permit the Director of the Census to make the selection himself in his own way for efficiency, which point the gentleman seems so exceedingly anxious about?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will say to the gentleman, he is a Member of the House, the same as I am. This is not my bill. I have no personal interest in it at all. I am simply a Representative of a district of Indiana, and I introduced the bill and took charge of it before because I happened to be chairman of the Committee on the Census in the last Congress. We sent a bill to the President during the last Congress and he vetoed it, and I have no doubt if we repeated the performance there would be another veto by the present President. We did not have the courage in the last Congress to take up and pass that bill over the veto of the President. Is it right now to embarrass the succeeding President with the same question? If Congress wanted that bill to become a law, why did it not pass it over the President's veto? Now, is it right to hand this same proposition up to the present Chief Executive? And if we do I have no doubt it will be vetoed. Does the gentleman want that done?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. No; certainly not.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman from Kansas vote for the same bill we passed in the last House?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. If the ex-chairman of the Committee on the Census presents that bill in the House, I will vote for it, as I did before, believing in that kind of legislation; but now the ex-chairman of the Committee on the Census suggests to Members of the House that we did not have the courage to pass the former bill over the veto of the President. Let me ask the ex-chairman of the Committee on the Census, the gentleman who is now acting as the chairman of the committee, why we did not have the courage to do that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Wait a moment. Was it not because the chairman of the Committee on the Census did not present it to the House and give the House an opportunity to pass upon that question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The chairman of the Committee on the Census had it referred to the Committee on the Census to get the temper of the House, and after consultation—

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. And never reported it back again.

Mr. CRUMPACKER (continuing). And after consultation Republicans by the score said that it would not do, that it could not be gotten through the Senate, and we should not attempt to override the veto. I think the gentleman appreciated the temper of the House as well as I did. However, I do not care to discuss that further.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I presume the earnest desire of the gentleman is to have this bill acted upon by the House and by Congress in order that we may get to the work of making

a correct census. Is that the purpose of this extraordinary rule?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I share the same desire that every Member of the House ought to have; I am simply a Member of the House.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. As I understand the bill, it purports to carry the views of the gentleman as to what should and should not be legislated upon. Is that correct?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, I do not know that it is, in every respect.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Then we will be glad to know in what respect it does not; but before I get to that point, in view of the urgency of this matter and with the knowledge the gentleman must possess—because he has made a study of this matter—in view of the fact that the Civil Service Commission has in the last two or three years been from nine to fourteen months certifying the eligibility of those who have passed examinations for positions, does the gentleman think that the Civil Service Commission can give us that quickness in dispatch in regard to those who are eligible in order that we may have a good census?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think if the gentleman would carefully read the bill he would find that is all taken care of.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. How?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The clerks are not appointed upon requisition to the Civil Service Commission. The Director of the Census will estimate the number of clerks he will need to have appointed, he will frame the character of the examination, and the Civil Service Commission will conduct that examination and will aim to have the examination broad enough to establish an eligible list to fill all the requirements, and then certify the whole list at once before the work begins to the Census Office, and it will be in the Census Office all the time.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I understand exactly what the bill provides. The Civil Service Commission have been from nine to fourteen months before they were able to certify who was eligible or who was not.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes. I think the Civil Service Commission is a few months behind in its work.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Then, why burden it?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is the reason why we incorporated in this bill a provision requiring the entire eligible registry to be certified over to the Director of the Census and to be in his office all the time, so he will not have to make requisitions to the Civil Service Commission to get certifications for each appointment. He must make appointments in the order of rating, beginning at the top, with the single exception that he may depart from that policy only to meet unforeseen exigencies. The President vetoed the other bill on account of the appointment provision. Congress did not see fit to pass it over his veto. We thus impliedly agreed that the President's method of appointment is the better one, and this bill is made now in spirit to conform to the President's suggestion. That is the object of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. What I want to ask the gentleman is this: The bill provides for these clerks to be examined by the Civil Service Commission. Will the same rules and regulations that now control that commission control as to the age in these temporary clerkships? For instance, a man over 45 years of age can not stand the civil-service examination. Will men beyond that age under this bill be excluded from standing the examination for this temporary service?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The bill provides that the Director of the Census shall prescribe the character of the examination.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. That is, about the kind of questions.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That means the general questions and limits. Whatever is included in a test examination, the age limit, the minimum and maximum, is involved. The Director of the Census will do that, and all the Civil Service Commission will have to do is the mechanical work of taking the examinations. It will have no discretionary power at all. The bill does not propose to confer any discretionary power upon the Civil Service Commission. All the discretionary power is in the Director of the Census and the commission is required to do what the Director of the Census suggests.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. In other words, he prescribes the regulations, and we are not governed by the regulations now in force?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No; he will not be required to be governed by the regulations now in force.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think we have gone over this appointment provision pretty fully, and I want to emphasize the importance of enacting this bill into law now, and of conforming the appointment provision in letter and spirit to the

views outlined in the message of the recent President in disapproving the other bill.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Before the gentleman passes on that, I would like to ask him if I am not correct in the understanding that the portions of the bill to which the recent President objected are all eliminated from this bill? As I understand it, there were two—the method of appointment, and that in relation to the Government Printing Office.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The President suggested that if we authorized the printing to be done outside of the Government Printing Office, the eight-hour law should be made applicable. The bill omits that provision altogether. It does not authorize the printing to be done outside of the Government Printing Office.

I have a letter before me from the director, written yesterday or to-day, stating that he had arrangements with the Public Printer, and that he was satisfied that entirely just and equitable terms could be obtained from the Government Printing Office for all the printing, and that it would not be necessary to go outside of the government office to have any work done. So that provision is out of the bill altogether.

Mr. BENNET of New York. If it will not interrupt the gentleman to make this statement, I will say that the new Public Printer now says that the work can be done, and he will guarantee it can be as cheaply done in the Government Printing Office as it can outside.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, the Director of the Census informs me the same, or substantially the same, in a letter which I received from him, and which I will incorporate in my remarks.

Now, one other amendment that was made: The other bill did not provide for the enumerating of the blind and deaf outside of public institutions. There were a large number of petitions or requests sent in after we had prepared the bill and it had passed the House, asking for that provision, and it was not made.

The Committee on Census ordered a resolution reported requiring the director to enumerate the blind and the deaf outside of institutions as well as in. We have incorporated that provision in one of the schedules in this bill, and the names and addresses of the blind and the deaf and dumb outside as well as inside public institutions will be collected.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will.

Mr. PERKINS. That information will be obtained by the same enumerators that go around and obtain the list and number of the population?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The same enumerators upon the same schedule, without any additional expense.

Mr. PERKINS. And it will require no additional enumerators?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It will require no additional enumerators and no additional expense, so the director informed the committee.

Mr. COX of Indiana. One other question, and that is whether there was a resolution passed by the Census Committee requiring the Director of Census to make reports on cotton?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That applies to the permanent office.

Mr. COX of Indiana. That is not in this bill?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is already law.

Now, I want to inquire if the gentleman from Virginia desires any time?

Mr. HAY. I will have the right to take the floor in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] for five minutes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address myself to the pending measure. So seldom is it in this House that we get a chance to talk about something before the House that that would be almost sufficient reason if I did not have any other. But, on looking through the provisions of this bill, it strikes me that no vital change has been made in it, and that it is practically the same measure that passed the House and was vetoed by the President. Now, I have not often been in a position where I could gladly and conscientiously follow the last President; but it so happens that I can say that I was with him, heart and soul with him, and believe that one of the best acts he ever performed while President of the United States was his veto of that measure. I can not speak too strongly on that subject. I have as much desire as any man in this House to make appointments in my district. I have as many intelligent men in my district as there are in any

other. I represent a population of over 400,000, and over 50,000 qualified voters. I am satisfied from the percentage that they furnish to the other departments of the service that the Census Bureau could look with confidence to the State of New Jersey and to my district for the full quota of able and efficient men.

As I understand the provisions of this bill, this clause, commencing on page 5 and line 5, which reads as follows:

Provided, however, That when the exigencies of the service require, preference may be given to eligibles who by reason of residence or other conditions are immediately available—

practically nullifies the provision it is proposed to safeguard, and under this language men can be taken in who are not necessarily qualified to do the work.

Now, I have seen a census taken by men who were appointed from purely political considerations. I have seen school censuses taken and state censuses taken by men appointed in that way. I have seen deplorable results that followed from that method and that system. I have seen men indicted and punished under the provisions of the census law for misdemeanors in not filing or furnishing information, their records being in such a condition that they themselves were ashamed to submit them to the proper authority; they would rather face a grand and petit jury than bring in to the authorities the work that they were never fitted to perform. I have the presumption to claim to be a man of average intelligence. The fact that I have been elected to fill a place in this body justifies me in that presumption. But I do not claim that I am better able than the Civil Service Commission to select the men from my district to perform this very important work which is to cost so much money at a time when money is very precious in this country.

But under the terms of the proviso no man can tell by what means an applicant is to get one of these places. He may pass a good examination and the "exigencies" may keep him from being appointed. He may have the indorsement of his Congressman or Senator, and the same influences prevail. The proviso is neither for civil service nor a frank opposition of the spoils system. I am against it.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I have heard with a great deal of interest what the gentleman from New Jersey said. I want to point out the fact that these clerks to whom he refers have to be on the eligible list. In other words, they must have stood the test examination provided for in the first part of this section.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. In the few minutes I had it was impossible for me to get to that stage of my argument.

Mr. HAY. Go ahead now.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I can state it briefly in the form of a question directed to the gentleman from Virginia. The language of the bill is that these applicants shall be subject to certain special test examinations, as the Director of the Census may prescribe; and under this language it is possible for the Director of the Census, yielding to the clamorous insistence of Members of Congress, to provide such a test that practically any man will be able to pass that examination.

Mr. LANGLEY. I will ask the gentleman from New Jersey if he thinks the Director of the Census is more likely to do that than are the members of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I will state again that under the language of the bill it seems to me that the test, being prescribed by the Director of the Census, may be of such a character that practically any man who can read and write can get upon the eligible list; not of course rated in such a way as to be likely to be appointed, but yet on the list; and then, once on the list, he is subject to the provisions of this proviso that when the exigencies of the service require, or these other conditions named, but with which we are not familiar, arise, then this man passing the test prescribed by the Census Director, and about which we know nothing, will be just as eligible, although far down on the list, as if he stood at the top.

Mr. HAY. I want to say to my friend from New Jersey that of course that might happen, but that it never will happen with the present Director of the Census.

Mr. LANGLEY. That was the point I was going to bring out.

Mr. HAY. He never would prescribe a test examination of the character referred to by the gentleman from New Jersey, because he is a man of very high character, with a great regard for the duties of his office, and he would not put himself in the attitude of prescribing an examination for the single and sole purpose of getting somebody a little clerkship.

Now, as I understand this provision, which is objected to not only by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] but by others, it is for the purpose of meeting some great exigency which may occur in the taking of this census and which has

occurred in the taking of other censuses, and it is not intended to cover into the service of the Census Bureau a large number of clerks who are unfit to perform the duties of the offices to which they may be appointed.

The only difference between this bill and the bill which was passed by the two Houses of the last Congress is in providing the test examination prescribed by the director, and appointing the clerks from the roll so made up, and the noncompetitive examination which was provided for in the other bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, the last bill to which the gentleman refers contained practically this same provision regarding a test examination.

Mr. HAY. Well, it was a noncompetitive examination.

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. HAY. It was a noncompetitive examination, under which and through which, if the gentleman had two constituents who passed the noncompetitive examination, one of them making a percentage of 80 and the other 95, the gentleman from Kentucky could have either one of them appointed.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is correct; and often I would get the best census clerk by doing that.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Does the gentleman claim this examination is competitive?

Mr. HAY. I do.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Is there any objection to having the bill amended so that it shall read that the examination shall be competitive?

Mr. HAY. It already so provides.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is the meaning of the language.

Mr. HAY. On page 5, line 5.

Mr. LANGLEY. It is another way of stating it.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. It is another way of stating it, perhaps, and yet it may be that the order of rating will be made to depend upon the time when the application was made or something of that kind, rather than upon the standing of the applicant in his examination papers.

Mr. LANGLEY. I think the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] has altogether too many misgivings about what the Director of the Census will do. I have served with him, and know that those misgivings are utterly groundless, and that he will give us an honest, conscientious, and faithful administration of the law, in whatever shape we pass it.

Mr. HAY. I want to say that I know it is a competitive examination, because it says in terms that they shall be appointed in the order of their rating.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I understand that, but—

Mr. HAY. And their rating, of course, is the mark which they receive on the examination; not the order in which they are examined, or anything of that kind. So, Mr. Chairman, I can not see any objection to this provision in the bill, and it seems to be the only provision in the bill that is causing any comment from any source. In all other respects the bill seems to be entirely proper and to meet the wishes of gentlemen on the floor.

I will say that at the proper time, when the bill is read for amendment, I propose to offer an amendment, in line 10, page 4, to strike out the words "and other employees," which will take from this competitive examination such people as the messenger boys and charwomen, because I do not believe it was intended that they should be placed under that provision.

Mr. LANGLEY. The words "other employees," literally construed, covers clerks also, so that the gentleman had better be careful in drawing his amendment.

Mr. HAY. It says "additional clerks and other employees."

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. COLE. What sort of an examination would the gentleman prescribe for charwomen?

Mr. HAY. I do not know, and that is one reason why I want to strike it out.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. What provision is made in this bill for printing?

Mr. HAY. There is no provision in the bill. It is to be done by the Government Printing Office. The provision with reference to printing reports outside the office, in the bill passed by the last Congress, is omitted.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I understood there was a great deal of objection to that.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia where is the language that he is going to move to strike out?

Mr. HAY. It is on page 4, line 19. I just said line 10, but that was a mistake.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. That was the reason that I put the question to the gentleman.

Mr. HAY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to yield to my friend from Indiana, who wants some time.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Before the gentleman yields, will he answer a question?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Under the gentleman's interpretation of this bill, is it not possible for the Director of the Census to employ all the clerks from Maryland, Virginia, or the District of Columbia?

Mr. HAY. It is possible, if they stand a better examination than the people who take the examination from other States. As I understand it, if a man from Kansas stands first on the list he is first to be appointed.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I am talking about cases of emergency.

Mr. HAY. Oh, well, the gentleman and others seem to think that everything is going to be emergency.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. No employees from other territory outside that which I have named will get in unless we have people here hanging around Washington waiting for employment, and I assure the gentleman that there will be none from the State of Kansas of that kind.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman must know that the emergencies referred to will not arise when this great force of clerks is first put on. There will be ample time for these examinations to be held, and for the gentleman's constituents to stand the examination and then come on here and take the place if they stand the examination.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. In the Twelfth Census I was the appointment clerk, and we had an arrangement whereby clerks were notified quite a while in advance that they would be required on a certain day and to notify us whether they would be ready to report for duty then. We fixed the number approximately that we would need on such day, and as a result of that arrangement there was no difficulty in bringing clerks promptly from all sections of the country and assigning them to duty without interrupting the work.

Mr. HAY. Then, let me ask the gentleman, were all the clerks appointed under the Twelfth Census for this emergency from Maryland and the District of Columbia?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly not; and the exigencies referred to under which this bill permits a departure from the order of rating scarcely ever arose.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. But they were not appointed under provisions like those in this bill. That is the reason they were not from Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANGLEY. But the Director of the Twelfth Census could have done what gentlemen suggest is possible to be done under this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Is it not true that under the Twelfth Census, when the gentleman was an appointment clerk, a very large majority of the number of the employees were from Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia—a larger proportion than from any other like territory in the United States?

Mr. LANGLEY. I am inclined to think that there was proportionally a larger number. I am not certain, but that is my recollection.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. And the exigency and emergency existed two or three weeks and sometimes more than a month, in the mind of the appointment clerk as well as the Director of the Census?

Mr. LANGLEY. I beg to disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How many clerks are there in the regular force in the Census Office at this time?

Mr. HAY. I do not know exactly; I suppose 700 or 800. I do not know about that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There is no limit by the provisions of this bill?

Mr. HAY. Yes; I think about 3,000. They are to be temporary clerks, to be used during the actual period of taking the census. Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Census of the Sixtieth Congress I voted to pass the bill out of the committee, and as a member of that committee I voted to pass the bill in the House early in the ses-

sion of Congress just closed. The then President of the United States saw fit not to approve the measure, and every man who voted for it was characterized as a politician, and the measure itself was characterized as a fraud, and was sent back to the House with his veto. To-day the bill comes before the House apparently endeavoring to meet the objections urged against the bill by the ex-President of the United States. We all agreed in the committee, and the House agreed, and I think will agree to-day upon this proposition, that accuracy and efficiency are two of the essentials we should strive for in trying to have the Thirteenth Census taken; and it was universally agreed and was so stated by General Merriam, the Director of the last census, before our committee that if you wanted accuracy, you would have to give the Director of the Census the freest hand you possibly could give him; and if Director North did not openly make that statement in our committee at least he gave his tacit assent to it, because he was present before the committee and read the bill and approved of section 7. Now, then, we reach this kind of a condition to-day, whereby it is proposed to appoint thirty-two or thirty-four hundred clerks, either under the Civil Service Commission or not under it; I do not know which, by the terms of the bill under consideration. The objections which I urge to this bill this evening are that it is, to my judgment, indefinite and uncertain. If you are going to put the taking of the census, so far as these clerks are concerned, directly under the Civil Service Commission, let us do it. If you are not going to put all of these clerks under the Civil Service Commission and you are going to throw the responsibility for efficiency upon the Director of the Census, let us do that.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Is there any doubt in the gentleman's mind about this being absolutely under the direction of the Director of the Census?

Mr. COX of Indiana. There is.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Director of the Census prescribes the examination and the Civil Service Commission simply conducts the examination, and after the Civil Service Commission has conducted the examination the Director, who has prescribed it, can set aside their findings and appoint anybody he likes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I did not yield to the gentleman for anything except a question.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I just wanted to clear up the gentleman's mind.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The gentleman has his idea as to what is clear and I have mine. Mr. Chairman, referring to section 7 of the bill, in my judgment you strike down one of the very vital provisions of the law; and do you propose to strike down that part of the law which requires that appointments to various positions shall be made throughout the United States with regard to area and population? I undertake to say that, in my judgment, the great western country will have but small, if any, opportunity to get a single, solitary one of these thirty-two or thirty-four hundred appointments of clerks for the taking of the Thirteenth Census.

Mr. FLOYD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. FLOYD. Where are these examinations to be held?

Mr. COX of Indiana. The bill does not provide.

Mr. FLOYD. Are they all to be held in Washington?

Mr. COX of Indiana. The bill does not provide.

Mr. FLOYD. Are they to be held by the same examiners who examine the civil-service applicants?

Mr. COX of Indiana. The bill does not provide.

Mr. FLOYD. Would they not be held throughout the country?

Mr. COX of Indiana. That would be the presumption, but whether they will or not the bill does not say, and here is the danger that overcomes that presumption, and that is the emergency clause that is attached to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAY. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Let me read:

Provided, however, That when the exigencies of the service require preference may be given to eligibles who by reason of residence or other conditions are immediately available.

Who is to determine when the exigencies of the occasion arise?

Mr. HAY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HAY. Was not that clause in the last bill?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes; but the last bill provided for a noncompetitive examination. I again ask the question, Who is to be the judge of when and where the exigency arises?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I will answer the gentleman by saying the Director of the Census, and nobody else.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The Director of the Census, and, in my judgment, that is the mare's nest in this entire bill, which absolutely destroys and completely nullifies the civil-service law.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Right on that point, did not the gentleman argue awhile ago that the Director of Census should have the freest possible hand in the matter?

Mr. COX of Indiana. I am taking the position that this bill ought to be framed upon one theory or the other—that I object to a bill being framed up here that will catch somebody coming or going.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I think I agree with the gentleman, and I believe he agrees with me, that the director should have a free hand in this matter and the Civil Service Commission ought to have nothing to do with it.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if ex-President Roosevelt was the true, genuine reformer that he was said to be, I want to call attention of this House to a bill which he signed two months ago providing for the appointment of a disbursing clerk at the insane asylum here in the District, which absolutely took 900 employees out of the civil-service employment and put them directly under the control of the disbursing clerk of that institution, and that bill is a law to-day. I make that argument, however, in response largely to his characterization of all this body of men who voted for this bill that they were "professional politicians;" that we had brought a bill upon this floor; and not only that, but had passed a law that was a fraud. Now, then, I oppose this bill for the reason, in my judgment, that it is uncertain. I oppose it because, in my judgment, it strikes down one of the vitally important principles in the civil-service law. I oppose it because, in my judgment, it will give to the Director of the Census absolute complete plenary power to appoint all of the 3,200 or 3,400 clerks from the District of Columbia or the immediate vicinity thereof.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Would not the gentleman's objection be at least largely met if the words "without regard to the law of apportionment" should be stricken out of line 4, page 5?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Comparatively it would, and I will say to the gentleman that if no one else does I am going to offer an amendment at that point when the time comes.

Mr. SCOTT. It seems to me that amendment is a very important one and ought to be adopted.

Mr. COX of Indiana. In conclusion, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I can not support this measure and act, in my judgment, consistently with the way I have acted heretofore. Let us put it all under the civil service completely and throw the responsibility upon it and let us leave it there, or else let us take it from the civil service and throw the responsibility directly upon the Director of the Census. But it was openly stated, I think, in debate here last winter in the Sixtieth Congress, at least at the hearing before our committee, that the Twelfth Census was the most important census that was ever taken in the United States, and that census was taken without a competitive examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further time to use. I do not know anybody at this time who desires time. If there is, I will be glad to yield time.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield to me for two minutes?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in reference to this bill that it seems that this bill does not meet with the approval of all the Members of the House; that the committee in considering this bill brought in a bill that they felt would accurately and economically take said census, which bill was vetoed by the President of the United States. Now, then, it seems to me that the only objection that can be urged against this bill in its present form is on line 4, page 5, to the words "without regard to the law of apportionment." It would seem to me if those words were stricken out that this would cover the objectionable part as near as we can and we would get the kind of a bill which we should now put up to the President of the United States, in view of what happened at the last Congress with reference to the census bill.

I do not think that we could afford to make any very serious changes in it, and while President Roosevelt objected in his veto seriously to those words, it seems to me had this been the

only part of the bill that was objectionable to him at that time he would not have vetoed it, and while the former chairman feels that it is very important that these words should remain in the bill, and believes if it is passed in its present shape with those words out that the President would feel that he would have to veto it, I do not feel that way about it. I feel that unless those words are stricken out that the Director of the Census will be put in a very embarrassing position in order to do what is really his purpose. While the District of Columbia, Virginia, and other near-by States have very much over their apportionment in the departments here, by leaving this paragraph in the bill they will take the examination, they will pass, and there will be a line for two squares from the Pension Office, and the Director of the Census will have no option whatever with regard to them. He will have to take them from the District of Columbia, Virginia, and other near-by States, and fill up this whole bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That the additional clerks and other employees provided for in section 6 shall be subject to such special test examination as the Director of the Census may prescribe, the said examination to be conducted by the United States Civil Service Commission, the examination to be open to all applicants without regard to political party affiliations. Copies of the eligible registers so established and the examination papers of all eligibles shall be furnished the Director of the Census by the Civil Service Commission, and selections therefrom shall be made by the Director of the Census, without regard to the law of apportionment, in the order of rating: *Provided, however*, That when the exigencies of the service require, preference may be given to eligibles who by reason of residence or other conditions are immediately available; and that preference may be given to persons having previous experience in census work whose efficiency records are satisfactory to the said director, who may, in his discretion, accept such records in lieu of said examination: *And provided further*, That employees in other branches of the departmental classified service who have had previous experience in census work may be transferred without examination to the Census Office to serve during the whole or a part of the decennial census period, and at the end of such service the employees so transferred, shall be eligible to appointment to positions of similar grade in any department without examination: *And provided further*, That during the decennial census period and no longer the Director of the Census may fill vacancies in the permanent force of the Census Office by the promotion or transfer of clerks or other employees employed on the temporary force authorized by section 6 of this act: *And provided further*, That at the expiration of the decennial census period the term of service of all employees so transferred and of all other temporary officers and employees appointed under the provisions of this act shall terminate, and such officers and employees shall not be eligible to appointment or transfer into the classified service of the Government by virtue of their examination or appointment under this act.

Mr. STERLING, Mr. HULL of Iowa, Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia, Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey, Mr. HAY, and Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 4, page 5, strike out the words "without regard to" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in conformity with."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the section as it is proposed to be amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That the additional clerks and other employees provided for in section 6 shall be subject to such special test examination as the Director of the Census may prescribe, the said examination to be conducted by the United States Civil Service Commission, the examination to be open to all applicants without regard to political party affiliations. Copies of the eligible registers so established and the examination papers of all eligibles shall be furnished the Director of the Census by the Civil Service Commission, and selections therefrom shall be made by the Director of the Census, in conformity with the law of apportionment, in the order of rating: *Provided, however*, That when the exigencies of the service require, preference may be given to eligibles who by reason of residence or other conditions are immediately available; and that preference may be given to persons having previous experience in census work whose efficiency records are satisfactory to the said director, who may, in his discretion, accept such records in lieu of said examination: *And provided further*, That employees in other branches of the departmental classified service who have had previous experience in census work may be transferred without examination to the Census Office to serve during the whole or a part of the decennial census period, and at the end of such service the employees so transferred shall be eligible to appointment to positions of similar grade in any department without examination: *And provided further*, That during the decennial census period and no longer the Director of the Census may fill vacancies in the permanent force of the Census Office by the promotion or transfer of clerks or other employees employed on the temporary force authorized by section 6 of this act: *And provided further*, That at the expiration of the decennial census period the term of service of all employees so transferred and of all other temporary officers and employees appointed under the provisions of this act shall terminate, and such officers and employees shall not be eligible to appointment or transfer into the classified service of the Government by virtue of their examination or appointment under this act.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The law of apportionment, if you leave in any of those words, will be whatever this bill provides for; and they can appoint under the other provisions of the bill, in my judgment, without any regard whatever to what the gentleman is seeking to arrive at. It seems to me that the object will be attained that we are discussing here if you strike out the words "without regard to the law of apportionment" and leave the law as it stands on the statute books. I think the amendment will defeat this entirely.

Mr. STERLING. I think the gentleman from Iowa is right in the proposition that if we would strike out those words the appointments would be made according to the civil-service law. The only difference between his proposition and the one I offer is this: That mine provides expressly that they shall follow the law relating to apportionment, while if you would strike out the words as he suggests it would probably be implied. I think that it is better that it be expressly stated in the bill here that the appointments shall be made without regard to the existing law.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would put in more than the gentleman suggests, namely, "in conformity with the existing law as to apportionment."

Mr. STERLING. I do not think that would add anything to it. I think it is perfectly clear to everybody that it refers to the law of apportionment as provided in the census law, and it is equally clear without those additional words.

Mr. LANGLEY. My understanding of it is that the law of apportionment applies only to the classified service. These positions provided for in this bill are not placed in the classified service, and therefore the gentleman's amendment, as it reads, will not accomplish his purpose, and I think the gentleman from Iowa is correct in the suggestion that the intent of Congress should be definitely specified, so as to make it clear that it refers to the law of apportionment as applied to the classified service.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would suggest to the gentleman to change the amendment by inserting, after the word "apportionment," the words "as now provided for the classified service."

Mr. STERLING. I have no objection to that. I do not think it adds anything at all excepting the words, and I will agree to the amendment offered to my amendment by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING] ask to modify his amendment?

Mr. STERLING. I will modify it in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING] asks to modify his amendment so that it will read as the Clerk will now report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 4, insert after the word "apportionment" the following, "as now provided by the classified service."

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I do not believe that will cover all that the gentleman intends it to cover.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING] yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HUGHES]?

Mr. STERLING. I do not, now. I will in just a minute. I desire to state what I understand will be effected by this amendment. I think I am right in my position with regard to it. As the bill is now unamended, it does not guarantee that the States will get their due proportion or that the localities throughout the country will get their due proportion of appointments. With this amendment, it would guarantee to all the States, the near-by States and the remote States, the same right and the same advantages and the same chances of having a representation in this service in the Census Office.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me? I was just afraid that the gentleman's amendment would not do what he suggests, and I would like to have the attention of the House to have his amendment read again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois as modified.

The amendment as modified was again reported.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, in the first place I hope the Committee of the Whole House will not so fashion this bill as to give the clerks and officers appointed under it a classified status, so that they will be eligible to be transferred and reappointed. That is one thing the bill aims to avoid. I do not know that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois would accomplish that purpose, but it is a step in that direction.

Now, judged by the merit system, Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is absolutely indefensible. The bill as it now stands provides that clerks shall be appointed in the order of rating, and if applicants in the State of Illinois stand highest on the eligible list, they will be appointed, not because they live in Illinois, but because they have shown the highest and best capacity for the service.

Mr. STERLING. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Not until I have finished this statement. (Continuing.) If, on the other hand, the law of apportionment shall be enforced upon this service, then a clerk in the State of Illinois of a low grade will have preference over a clerk in another State who may have a better grade and have shown much higher capacity for public service. He will be forced into the service, not because of his ability but because he happens to live in the State of Illinois. I state to the gentleman from Illinois that that is the reason why the bill that was passed by the last Congress was vetoed by the President. It was not based upon the merit system.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had already addressed the Chair, and had preferred his request. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. STERLING. The gentleman from Indiana says that the proposition is indefensible. If it is indefensible in this law as applied in this case, it is also indefensible in the civil-service law. This places this bill and these appointees in strict conformity with the civil-service law.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If the gentleman pleases, I yielded to him for a question. I realized the force of his comparison. It is an illogical feature of the civil-service law; it is illogical because it is not true to the merit system. The appointments are not based upon merit alone; they are based in many instances upon the accident of location; and the gentleman knows that the purpose is to undertake to establish a pure merit system of appointment. The character of this service being peculiar and of a temporary nature, we have taken it out from under the general provisions of the civil-service law.

Mr. STERLING. Is it not true that that provision of the civil-service law has worked satisfactorily?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know that it has—

Mr. STERLING (continuing). And thereby the States have got a fairer proportion than they would have had had it not been in existence?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Judging from the temper of this House on both sides of the aisle, the civil-service law has not always operated in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. STERLING. I say in that regard.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from Indiana permit a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield now to the gentleman from Kentucky. I will have to ask for a brief extension of my time.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it not true that any man who would be put upon the eligible list would be put there by virtue of the fact that he was competent to perform the service? Is not that the whole theory of the eligible list?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That implies that the eligible list means competency as far as a test examination is evidence of competency; and under the rating system, if it is of any value, applicants who secure the highest rating will have the greatest competency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, is it not true that a man who had the lowest average and was yet on the eligible list, if that examination means anything, would yet be competent to perform the service?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, yes; in a way.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, does not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois simply mean this, that instead of having your competents taken as they would be, under the discretion lodged in the director, from this locality, that you would have to distribute them throughout the country?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, but the gentleman loses sight of the fact that there are grades of efficiency and competency, degrees that are illustrated by the ratings. One man may be a powerful man physically and another man less strong, and so on down the line; but the minimum may be fairly strong enough to do the work that is required and yet not as capable as the best. If you undertake to establish a merit system, you should prefer the applicants who show by the test that they have the

highest degree of efficiency. That is the only test of a true merit system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to submit the testimony of a few competent witnesses on this question. The Director of the Census, before the Committee on the Census and in his annual report, expressly requested that the law of geographical apportionment should not apply to the temporary census office. A committee of experts, appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor a year ago last January to examine the bill, made the same recommendation. The President, in his veto message of the bill recently passed by Congress, among other things said:

In view of the temporary character of the work, it would be well to waive the requirements of the civil-service law as regards geographical apportionment.

Now, I want the Committee of the Whole House to have these facts before them.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will.

Mr. TAWNEY. As I read and understand the language which the gentleman quotes from the message of ex-President Roosevelt, it is a mere suggestion on his part that it might be well to waive the geographical apportionment because of the temporary character of the work. He does not give any facts or any argument. It is a mere matter of opinion. Now, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] knows, as does every other gentleman representing a Western State on the floor of this House, that even under the existing civil-service law, with this express provision in regard to geographical apportionment, none of the Western States have ever received their full apportionment in the civil service or in the service of the executive departments here in Washington.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And they will not under this proposition, because—

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not think they will to the full extent; but I do think that if this is allowed to remain in here we will get only what is left after Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia are satisfied.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If the chief purpose of the measure is to get places for applicants, then the gentleman is right. If its object is to equip the Census Office so that it can best conduct this work for the people, then the gentleman is wrong.

Now, I want to say this to the committee, and I wish to have the attention of the Members for a moment: I sincerely believe that the appointments will be better distributed and more equitably distributed geographically under the bill as it is drawn than under the bill if it should include the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I wish the special attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], who seems to be an enthusiastic champion of the policy of distributing as many of the appointments as possible to the State of Iowa in the next census.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The gentleman is right about that.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, if we have the geographical rule, there will be more frequent exigencies, and the Director of the Census will be required more often to make appointments under the exigency provision. That necessarily follows, and the result will be an increased number of appointments made from the District of Columbia, Virginia, and the adjoining territory. If we make these appointments according to the order of rating, whenever Iowa has an applicant who has the best rating that applicant will be appointed, not because he lives in Iowa, but because he has shown the highest merit. The same rule will apply to Ohio and Kentucky and Kansas. That is the policy of the law, and the exigency proviso will only be utilized when unforeseen matters arise—matters that could not be provided against by ordinary foresight.

But if you hamper the law with this geographical provision there will be exigencies up every week, and I have no question that it will double the percentage of clerks who will be appointed in the District of Columbia and the immediate neighborhood.

I ask gentlemen if they are not willing to have applicants from their State stand a test on the merit proposition with applicants from other States? Are they afraid that the applicants from their States can not stand that test? That is all we require in the enactment of this law. I think it is a reasonable proposition. It is recommended by every expert who has given the matter any consideration at all, and is recommended by the President of the United States. I ask the Committee of the Whole to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he wishes the competitive examination to be based on an examination in which all who compete in the United States shall be eligible, and the highest to be taken therefrom?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. All the whole country.

Mr. FINLEY. Does not the gentleman understand that that would hardly be fair; that those who come from the colleges and high schools would inevitably have the advantage?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Is there any difference in the distribution of the high schools and colleges throughout the country? If so, the delinquent States ought to get busy and encourage high-school and college education.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman think that any better service would be rendered the country by the appointees from that class?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That question is an indictment against the whole merit system, and I am assuming that we intend to adopt the merit system; I am assuming that Congress intends to incorporate the merit system into the bill.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, so far as the candidates for places under this bill from Iowa are concerned, I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana that I am not asking any favors for them except to put them on an equality with the people who live near Washington. I am not opposed to their being required to pass as rigid an examination as any other class of people must pass to be eligible for appointment; but with the gentleman's bill as it is, I regard it as absolute folly for a man as far from the seat of government as Iowa to undertake an examination. A few will get in, but it will be because the supply has been exhausted near the seat of government. No man from a distance will stand a first chance.

There is to my mind one thing, judging from the debate here, that the membership of the House would like to have done, and that is to have these appointments apportioned among the States according to the population as near as practicable. If this amendment which is now pending is voted down, I shall offer this, striking out all those words without regard to the law of apportionment and inserting these:

In making such selections they shall be apportioned among the States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories as nearly as practicable in proportion to population.

I do not believe that I could offer it as a substitute; but if the gentleman from Illinois will withdraw his amendment, I will offer this.

Mr. STERLING. I could not do that; but is not that just what the civil-service law does now?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. This seems to be a bill independent of the general civil-service law. I want to say to the gentleman that I propose to offer another amendment to this page of the bill, lower down, affecting the transfer back to the civil service. In my judgment, this language is so plain that no man can misunderstand it. The language of the amendment we have been perfecting may be misunderstood, and it may be wrongly applied; but if this passes, the Director of the Census must take that in the order of the States, apportioning these temporary clerks among the States according to the population, and then, when it comes to Iowa or South Carolina, he would select from the eligible registry then standing the highest, unless those States shall have no eligibles, and then he could fill it up from other States.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The amendment the gentleman proposed strikes me as having more merit in it; but upon whom will it throw the burden in determining the number and rate of distribution?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. On the Director of the Census. The language of the bill is that they shall be furnished to the Director of the Census. Then in making such selection they shall be apportioned among the States as nearly as may be, according to population.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Whether or not the gentleman thinks that the amendment is strong enough to bind the Director of the Census so as to compel him to operate under the civil-service law?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The Civil Service Commission must furnish him under this law all that he can select from. If there are no eligibles from my State, he can take others. I want to say to my friend that if it is known in your State and my State and other States distant from the seat of government that their rights are preserved if they pass an examination, they will take the examination and be ready to come when their turn comes; but if you leave it as you have it in this bill, you will have very few men who will take the examination, because of the almost positive certainty that no one, or but very few, will get in.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman think that the proviso which immediately follows takes all the virtue out of an amendment that we can put on?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think not.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is the point that I was going to make.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think the Director of the Census would be exceedingly slow to go to work and ignore the law in order to select men around the seat of government.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It says, "when the exigencies of the service require." Who is to determine that?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would not limit him on that.

Mr. LANGLEY. How could the Director of the Census comply with that provision that he shall appoint them in the order of rating if your proposition prevails?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I can not tell that.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING] will prevail and if not, then that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] will prevail. I have no sympathy with the theory of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], in selecting all of them on the highest standard of rating. That does not mean necessarily the greatest efficiency. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] put the whole question in brief when he said that any man or woman who passes the required rate of per cent is presumably able to perform the duties assigned. Now, this simply means an equitable distribution of these appointees. It is well known—and if it is not I make it as a declaration—that this city has several schools having for their purpose the training of young men and women for what? Not to be educated along any broad lines as men are educated in colleges and universities, but on specific lines, and for what? To pass the civil-service examinations for a specific thing. And not only that. In some way, they tell me, they are able to get almost an exact, if not an absolutely correct list of the questions that the Civil Service Commission presents to its candidates, giving them every point of advantage over the young men from Iowa or from Kentucky or from the Dakotas or from the South or from the great West.

Mr. FOELKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. FOELKER. Are we to understand from the gentleman's remarks that the Civil Service Commission is in league with these various schools or universities or whatever they may be who train young men for these specific purposes?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the gentleman has asked that question because I would not have that inference drawn from anything I have said. The gentlemen composing the Civil Service Commission are high-grade men, and would scorn to be in league with that sort of thing; but in some way, I know not how, the papers get out and these schools get them. They advertise they can do that, and boast of their ability to assure young men and women that they will pass the examination, if they will only patronize their schools, and then give the percentage that do pass after they have taken this special coaching.

I submit to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] that that kind of an education does not qualify a young man or a young woman for independent thinking or acting, or doing anything but the most routine work. Give me the young man or woman who passes on his or her intellectual merit for what he or she knows and knows in general, rather than the one who passes on some specific questions that have been laid down to them, and that they have been coached upon and are able to answer accordingly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan know of any service in any of the departments here that involves any independent thinking or action? Is it not all purely routine and mechanical? That is peculiarly true of the Census Office.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Does the gentleman say that Mr. Cortelyou or the present Postmaster-General did not have some initiative, some independent thinking, and they did not take their examinations from a bureau prepared to coach them into a successful taking of the civil-service examination?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, they did not develop that capacity in the lower lines of work. That was congenital with them.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. If their biographies are correct, they did reveal it, and it is the survival of the fittest there as elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANGLEY) there were—ayes 100, noes 25.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 19, page 4, after the word "employees," insert "except messengers, assistant messengers, messenger boys, watchmen, unskilled laborers, and charwomen."

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, that amendment takes from under this provision the people in those grades.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 24, page 4, strike out the period and insert:

"And such examinations shall be held at such places in each State as may be designated by the Civil Service Commission."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that that is the law now. We have civil-service boards all over the country.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. If it is the law now, it can do no harm to expressly state it in the bill.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on page 5, line 18—and I hope my friend from Indiana will listen to this—by striking out the words "of similar grade" and inserting after the word "department," in line 19, the words "held by them at the date of transfer to the Bureau of the Census."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 18, page 5, strike out the words "of similar grade," and in line 19, after the word "department," insert "held by them at the date of the transfer to the Bureau of the Census."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my object in this amendment is to prevent men being transferred into the census work from departments and then after two years', or even much less, service being transferred back to the department at a higher grade and salary. Now, my amendment provides that they shall be transferred back to the department at a grade similar to that which they held at the time of their transfer to the census; but if we leave it in the language of the bill as reported by the committee, it would provide that any favorite who gets into the Census Office could be put up over the head of other employees in the departments, and by only a short service in the Bureau of the Census get high promotion in the departments. The census work is temporary; the department work is permanent; and I submit it is not fair to other government clerks to permit this kind of favoritism.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I hope gentlemen will listen to me before they vote upon this proposition. If a clerk is transferred because of his capacity from another department to perform work in the Census Office, he may be there two years or three years; and if the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa is adopted, he will lose all opportunity of promotion that he might otherwise merit during that two years he is absent from the regular service. Is it a just proposition to deprive a clerk transferred of all opportunity of promotion that he would have had if he had continued in the service from which he was transferred? Then, again, there may not be any opening in the department of the class that he occupied at the time. The transfer provision will be exercised only when it is necessary to secure experienced clerks along some particular line from other departments for some particular work in the Census Office, and generally those who have had experience in census work. There are quite a number of clerks in other departments who are skilled in statistical work who have been transferred from the Census Office. Now, it would hardly be fair to require them to submit to a transfer and to prevent them from having the opportunity of promotion during the period of their absence.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Under this law there is no provision, is there, of any kind which provides that a clerk must yield to a transfer to the Census Bureau?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think if the department orders a transfer the clerk must go.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I do not so understand it, Mr. Chairman, and we ought to avoid the very objection made by the

chairman of the committee or the gentleman having this matter in charge. They do not have to go, but if they do they ought not to be certified back to another department at a much higher salary than that which they received when they went.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If it is discretionary with them, and this amendment prevails, you might as well strike the transfer provision out of the bill. You can not get a clerk voluntarily to accept a transfer under those conditions, because it would be to his positive disadvantage. The Census Office will not call for the transfer of a low-grade clerk, for it will only be a high-grade, efficient clerk that there will be any object in having transferred.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is one that ought to be adopted. It is well known that in the work of the Census Bureau and in the taking of the next census there will be a number of employees in other departments transferred to the Census Bureau because of their peculiar fitness for the work of that bureau. It is also true, as the Director of the Census stated to the Committee on Appropriations in the last session of Congress, that men of that class will receive higher compensations for their services than they would if employed permanently either in the Census Bureau or in any bureau of any other department of the Government. It is special service, it is temporary, and therefore requires and will receive higher compensation than that service would otherwise receive.

Now, as the bill has been reported it proposes to authorize the retransfer of these men back to the department from which they were transferred at the compensation which they receive in the Census Bureau for these special services of a temporary character. I do not think that it would be just to the Government to allow a promotion of that kind. The man transferred would not get the promotion in the department by reason of service there. He would get a promotion by reason of special temporary services in the Census Bureau. For that reason, I think it is absolutely right that when he goes back to the department, after he has had the benefit of this increased compensation during this temporary employment, he should go back to the department in a position or at a grade not below or not above the grade in which he was formerly employed.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him if he does not bear in mind the fact that this provision is not new? This provision is the identical provision that met the approval of the House in the last session of Congress, as well as of the Senate, and is among the provisions that brought an expression of approval from the President. He said, with the two exceptions he made, it was in effect an excellent bill. Are we to go over this whole thing again and thrash it out? We approved it by a decisive vote.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understood, Mr. Chairman, that we were considering the bill de novo, notwithstanding the remarks of the gentleman. I doubt if the attention of the committee or of the House was called to this provision when it was considered in the last Congress.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I want to quote the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of last session, as against the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to-day. He helped to put it through. He voted for it.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is true. I know I helped to prevent its going through at the first session of the last Congress, with the aid of several other Members. My attention was called to this provision only a short time ago in reading over the bill, and being somewhat familiar with the way in which clerks are transferred around here from one department to another for the purpose of securing promotion, it occurred to me that this was opening another door to accomplish that end.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, neither of the propositions pending before the House is, in my judgment, as it ought to be, and I wish the chairman of the committee would redraw the provision to meet the difficulty which he means to remedy. When the provision was incorporated in the bill for the transfer of clerks from one bureau in a department to another, or from one department to another, at a higher grade and salary, a difficulty was imported into the service on the matter of promotion that can only be avoided by a specific provision of some length. It is unfair, as the chairman of the committee suggests, to take a man out of his own bureau, put him in the census for three years, let him miss the opportunities of promotion that would there occur to him, and then transfer him back to his old grade. It is equally unfair and unjust to take a thousand-dollar man, who may have some expert knowledge on the census, give him a \$1,400 or a \$1,600 place in the census for two or three years, and then retransfer him over the heads of a hundred men that stood on the rolls above him before he was transferred. Either proposition carries with it a radical wrong.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman allow me? Which does he prefer?

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. I do not think we should take either. I will plead guilty to the accusation, if you want to make it, that I should have drawn the provision about which I make the suggestion. You want to transfer the man back to the place that he probably would have been in had he not been transferred. Besides, that place will be filled. Somebody will have the place that he would otherwise have got. To put him back at a higher grade is to take a man into a grade that is not needed in that service. A man of that grade is appointed to the place that he would have had, had he been there. A man will have been put in his place, because a vacancy occurred by reason of his being made a clerk in the Census Office. That seems to be the difficulty that the chairman has. I think that on retransfer he should be taken back as of that grade which, in the judgment of the Secretary or the head of the bureau, he would have had had he remained in that service; to either deprive him of all advantage of promotion during his absence from the service, or give him undue advantage because he is absent a year and is given the increase from having some expert knowledge, is equally unjust, and they both equally tend to the demoralization of the service.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment would be very unfair, for the reason which has been stated by the gentleman from New Jersey. If a clerk can be transferred from some other department to the Census Bureau and in the Census Bureau he gets a great deal of experience that will be of benefit to him in departments of the Government outside of the Census Office, when the man can be employed in statistical work in the Census Office and in making examinations throughout the country when agents are sent out from the Census Office, and then he can be transferred back to the Agricultural Bureau, where the same class of work is valuable for him to do, and where it is entitled to a higher salary than he was having when he left his position formerly, and had him go and perform this kind of service and then be transferred back at a higher pay, I think is very unfair.

Now, a man can not be transferred into another bureau of the Government unless there is a vacancy. Therefore at the end of his service in the Census Office he will not necessarily take anybody else's place, but will take the same place at a similar salary that was vacant; and he can not be transferred at a higher rate than he is now receiving. For instance, he leaves the Agricultural Department and goes into the Census Office, and gets a salary of \$1,200 and stays in there two or three years and then should be transferred back to the Agricultural Bureau, he could only be transferred back at a \$1,200 salary, and then he could only be transferred if a vacancy occurs. Now, I think this amendment would be very unfair. I believe the House should not adopt it, but leave the bill as it now stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 5, strike out the proviso beginning on line 5 and ending on line 12.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out that section of the bill to which I made objection when the bill was being considered in general debate. I want to call the attention of members of the committee to this fact. The section which deals with the kind of examination prescribed by the Census Director conducted by the Civil Service Commission contains absolutely no reference to the percentage a man must obtain. So that any man who makes an application to the Civil Service Commission for a position under this section of the act must be certified to the Director of the Census, no matter what he gets in that examination. Now, that brings us so that everybody is carried over with all the papers and all the examinations; every name is carried bodily to the Director of the Census. Now, this provision states:

That when the exigencies of the service require, preference may be given to eligibles who by reason of residence or other conditions are immediately available.

So that this provision is only a civil-service affair in name; and, in my judgment, it is simply an attempt to "beat the devil around the stump."

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the language he is proposing to strike out is the exact language now provided in one of the civil-service rules?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. LANGLEY. But I do.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. And it does not make any particular difference. Under this language there will not be anything like a civil-service regulation applying to the selection of these men—

Mr. LANGLEY. Why not?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey (continuing). And yet we are trying to go before the country and give the impression that this is a different kind of bill from that which the President vetoed. In my judgment this bill is worse than the bill the President vetoed, because in this bill, and I do not care what the gentleman says about the civil-service regulation, a man who obtains a 25 or 30 per cent rating will be certified with all the papers to the Director of the Census.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I do not think I am mistaken.

Mr. LANGLEY. But he is. Only eligibles are to be certified to the director, with their examination papers. The Director of the Census has the power to prescribe a test examination, and with that power goes the power to fix the minimum rating that the applicant shall receive to be eligible, and that will probably be at least 70 or 75 per cent.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. There is no language in this bill which will admit of the construction that the gentleman seeks to put upon it. At least, he is injecting something into this discussion that the House has no knowledge of, so far as this particular legislation is concerned. I desire to repeat that under the plain intent and meaning of this bill, a man can make application to the Civil Service Commission, take the examination, receive a percentage of 15, 20, or 30, be certified to the Director of the Census, and then, if he determines that the exigencies of the service demand it, or that the man is for some other reason available, he may be appointed over the head of a man who received a percentage of 100.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that the language in section 7, which gives the Director of the Census the power to prescribe the special test examination, necessarily carries with it the power to fix the rate of per cent that applicants shall pass before their names can go upon the eligible list. In the Twelfth Census that minimum rating was 70 per cent. I take it for granted that that will probably be the rating fixed by the director under this bill, and the construction put upon this provision by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] is certainly entirely incorrect and misleading to the House, because it is preposterous to say that the Director of the Census would desire to appoint anyone who could only get a rating of 15, 20, or 30 per cent in this test examination, or that the minimum will be fixed so low.

I think also that this amendment should not be adopted for another reason: If we are going to conform in any degree to the civil-service idea in this bill, then the proposition of the gentleman from New Jersey should be voted down, because he proposes to strike out of the bill a provision which is identical with a civil-service regulation now in force, and which regulation is followed by the Civil Service Commission in making certifications whenever an exigency like the one contemplated in this bill arises in any branch of the classified service. The gentleman is contending for civil service, and yet is opposing a civil-service proposition.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Would it not be almost impossible to take an efficient census without this provision?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes, I think so; and it is put in the bill chiefly, I take it, to meet the objection raised in the discussion of the bill at the last session—that it would be impracticable for the Director of the Census to bring clerks here from remote sections of the country on a competitive basis with sufficient promptness to meet the requirements of the work, especially in cases of emergency; and this provision is put in to enable him, whenever he needs a clerk and can not get promptly the one highest on the list, to meet the exigency by the appointment of an eligible who is nearer to or at the seat of government who is lower on the list. This situation would not often arise, however.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the one of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "when the exigencies of the service require." Also in line 7, the words "or other conditions," and insert after the word "that," in line 5, the words "only after due notice to those on the eligible register."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any of the amendments which have been already adopted to this bill

will in any material way curtail the absolute power of the Director of the Census to do exactly as he pleases concerning these appointments unless something further is done regarding this provision. The provision now reads—

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not for a moment, until I have explained this matter. The provision now reads:

Provided, however, That when the exigencies of the service require, preference may be given to eligibles who by reason of residence or other conditions are immediately available.

In other words, it is absolutely within the discretion of the Director of the Census to say what the "exigencies of the service" require and, second, what "the other conditions" are; so that it is utterly useless for us to try to save for our States a fair proportion of the eligible appointments if we leave that provision in. Now, this amendment, if it is adopted as a substitute for the provision of the gentleman, will read in this way:

That only after due notice to those on the eligible register preference may be given to eligibles who by reason of residence are immediately available.

Mr. LANGLEY. Due notice of what?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Due notice of the appointment.

Mr. LANGLEY. That will defeat the very purpose of the provision. The amendment of the gentleman deprives the Director of the Census of the power to meet the exigency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I do not think it does deprive the director of the power to meet the emergency. It does require him to give the eligibles at a distance due notice to appear here and accept their appointment. What is the use of getting men upon the eligible list who live in Ohio or Nebraska or Montana if they get no notice of an appointment to appear here? In other words, those who by reason of residence and other conditions are immediately available, those who stay here and press for appointments are the ones that will get the places.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman think he ought to put those words into the amendment as he offers it, so that after due notice to the other party the director can go on and make appointments, and so forth?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment by adding the words "only after due notice of their appointment."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment, which he offers as a substitute, so that it will read as follows.

The Clerk read as follows:

Only after due notice of their appointment to those on the eligible register.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to submit some remarks in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I thought the gentleman had closed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I want to do is to take away from the director—and I want to say that I have had some experience with his arbitrary and unjust disposition regarding this question—to take away from him the right of judging of the conditions and judging of the exigencies of the service so as to put in anybody he pleases that is immediately available.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. With whom would the gentleman lodge discretion? It must be lodged with somebody; and if not with the Director of the Census, who has the work in charge, with whom would he lodge it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would lodge the discretion with him, but I would hedge it about with some provision that would require him to give notice to those who are entitled to the places in season for them to come here.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I sympathize with the object of the gentleman, but it must be lodged with the Director of the Census, if you are going to take a census at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree with the gentleman, but I think the discretion should not be left with the director to ignore the examinations that have been taken and appoint eligibles here that are immediately available. It simply means that these eligibles who are on the ground from Virginia, Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Massachusetts may have these places to the exclusion of the eligibles who are not immediately available.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am not in sympathy with the purpose of the gentleman's amendment. I believe that the discretion ought to be left with the Director of the Census, but I do not believe that the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio would accomplish his purpose at all if

incorporated into the bill. It would simply read "only after due notice to the successful applicants of their appointment preference may be given to eligibles who by reason of residence," and so forth. That would not accomplish the purpose the gentleman is seeking to secure. You would notify the people that they had been appointed and that is all, and then go on and give preference to the others whom the exigencies of the service would make it desirable should be appointed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I admit that construction is possible, and I ask to further modify my amendment by saying "due notice of their appointment on the eligible register and their failure to accept."

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Will the gentleman from Mississippi permit a suggestion?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as follows—

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I object to the gentleman modifying his amendment. I do not think that any gentleman should offer an amendment without knowing more about the question. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will offer it later, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be read as now modified.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been modified; the gentleman from West Virginia objected.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I hope this provision of the bill will not be stricken out or modified as suggested by the gentleman from Ohio. His amendment is utterly inconsistent with the spirit of the proviso. The bill contemplates that appointment shall be made from the eligible register, according to rating, and, of course, it contemplates that the director will know in advance the number of clerks he will actually require in the normal development of the work in the office; but it provides that when exigencies arise and he may need a number of clerks immediately, he may depart from the general method of appointment provided in the bill, and select those at hand. The amendment of the gentleman from Ohio provides that if an exigency arises the director may select from those that may be immediately available, provided he has already given notice to those who are regularly on the list, and who would otherwise be entitled to appointment, and give them reasonable time to get here. It is utterly inconsistent, it seems to me; it is an absurd proposition because the director can not know in advance when an exigency is going to arise and can not give the notice the gentleman desires.

If he knows the exigency in advance, he will make appointments regularly. It is an absurd proposition on its face. Another thing: I regard this limited discretion of the Director of the Census as of vital importance. Let me emphasize again the experience of the Government in the Eleventh Census in 1890. The Director of the Census, the superintendent then, was surrounded by conditions and his power was circumscribed, and the census was strangled to death by department red-tapeism and was not worth 25 cents on the dollar for what it cost the Government. This bill does vest discretion in the Director of the Census, and that discretion is necessary because of the numerous exigencies that may arise. This is a gigantic work. The enumerations must be made, and the sorting and the punching and the tabulation and the printing of this great work must be done, and the reports must be ready for distribution within a fixed time. There is no time to lose. There is no time for delay waiting for three days' notice or six days' notice for a corps of clerks somewhere in the country. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that if the committee should adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio it would take a large step toward shackling the Census Office and embarrassing its progress, and add greatly to the expense of administering the work. I sincerely hope the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio will be voted down.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the original amendment. I do not know just exactly what state that is left in by the modification offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DOUGLAS], and I will ask now that when I close and before the vote upon the modification offered by the gentleman from Ohio is taken the original amendment be read, as well as the modification offered. For the information of the members of the committee, I will say that my amendment strikes out the entire proviso, beginning on line 5, page 5.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment that I have offered, and in place thereof I offer the following.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I object. I insist on voting on amendments as they are offered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well; then I will offer it further on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey moves to strike out the first paragraph on page 5. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment to perfect that amendment, which the Clerk will now report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, in lines 5 and 6, strike out the words, "when the exigencies of the service require," and also in line 7 the words, "or other conditions," and insert after the word "that," in line 5, the words, "only after due notice of their appointment to those on the eligible register."

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Ohio to perfect the text takes precedence. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, to strike out the proviso.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey) there were—ayes 38, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 8, beginning with the word "and," strike out the remainder of said line and lines 9, 10, and 11, and the words "said examination" on line 12.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the words that I propose to strike out are as follows:

And that preference may be given to persons having previous experience in census work whose efficiency records are satisfactory to the said director, who may, in his discretion, accept such records in lieu of said examination.

Now, there are only two classes of people who will be affected by this, those who could stand the examination now and have had previous experience in census work, and those who could not stand the examination now and have had previous experience in census work. If they have the qualifications ten years later to do efficient work, they can stand the examination, and ought to stand it, and if they have not the qualifications they should not be put in to encumber the government service simply because ten years ago they did have the qualifications.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Does the gentleman understand that there is a whole lot of work that is done in the Census Office which does not require an educational qualification, but experience with punching machines, cards, and tabulating; and the people who have had experience in that line can do twice or three times as much work as people without such experience?

Mr. SHERLEY. Then I will say that the remedy would be to make this specific kind of employment free from the test of a mental examination; but the remedy is not to throw the doors down and let all old ineligible in because they were eligible ten years ago and are now to be presumed to be eligible.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I will say for the information of the gentleman that it was the intention to cover this class.

Mr. SHERLEY. It may have been the intention, but it does not have the effect. The effect of it is to load the service down with a lot of incompetents who ten years ago may have been competent.

Mr. LANGLEY. That was not the effect of the operation of the law.

Mr. SHERLEY. It will be the operation now. I happen to know something about the applications of the people who came to me with the claim that ten years ago they did this work who are now too old and incompetent, and this would simply bring into the service such a class of clerks. The gentleman knows one of the great abuses in the service to-day is the fact that we have a lot of people there who by age are no longer fit to do the work, and yet the Government does not feel it is proper to turn them out into the world. There is no reason why we should add to that number of people by putting in the Census Office a lot of such people who are now out of the service.

Mr. LANGLEY. Nor will the effect of this proviso be to add to that number.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think it would. The gentleman and myself differ as to the effect of the proviso.

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HAY. Does the gentleman think that the Director of

the Census, who is charged with this work and who is responsible for the accuracy with which the census is taken, would appoint a lot of inefficient people to do such work?

Mr. SHERLEY. I answer the gentleman by saying that if in this regard he can trust the Director of the Census, why put any restrictions on him? Why, every restriction you put on him is on the supposition that there will be sufficient political pressure to keep him from doing his full duty and which will make him yield to that pressure. I do not want to have him subjected to that pressure. I know what it will be. Every man who has had experience with the departments knows what it will be, and if these people are competent they can stand the examination, and if they are not they ought not to be put in there.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Has it not been reported from responsible quarters that a good many incompetents were employed in compiling the last census?

Mr. SHERLEY. We have had that statement from the gentleman from Indiana to-day several times, if not in the last census, in the one twenty years ago.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not say there were any incompetents employed in the Eleventh Census, but I stated that the system of red-tapism had broken down its efficiency.

Mr. SHERLEY. I should say that that was evidence of incompetency.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman if these incompetents were not covered into the classified service at the close of the compilation—

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand some were.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. And that they are now there?

Mr. SHERLEY. But there is no reason, in my judgment, why any man should be now put in the service on his record of previous work of ten years ago. If he is competent now he can take and pass the examination.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Do you think their efficiency has been increased in the last ten years?

Mr. SHERLEY. I should hardly think it should be, judging by our experience with such persons.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the—

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman ask me a question, or is he making a speech?

Mr. LANGLEY. I thought the gentleman had yielded the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. I happen to have some personal knowledge of the origin and necessity of this provision. Twenty years ago even, tolerably accurate records were kept of the efficiency records of certain employees of that census, particularly those who were skilled in operating the punching and tabulating machines, and we were anxious during the Twelfth Census, wherever we could, to engage the services of such an employee of the previous census where he had had that sort of training and was an expert. And I undertake to say that if you strike out this provision you will deprive the Director of the Census of an opportunity of getting some very valuable employees, possessing qualifications by reason of their expert knowledge of and equipment for certain portions of the census work which no sort of an educational test could determine.

Mr. COX of Indiana. May it not be possible also for the Director of the Census to get some one who is not competent?

Mr. LANGLEY. That suggestion has been repeatedly made here.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is it not true?

Mr. LANGLEY. I am unable to understand why gentlemen make it. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has stated, we must repose some confidence in the integrity of officers like the Director of the Census. We must take it for granted that he is going to endeavor to administer the law properly, to the best of his ability and for the best interests of the service, and I will undertake to say that, in my judgment, there would not be under this provision a single appointment made of an old incompetent former census employee, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has suggested. The purpose of it is, and the desire of the director in asking for this provision is, to give him an opportunity to get for a limited time that class of persons who have had particular training in this peculiar and exceptional class of work, adaptability to which no educational test could possibly determine.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey rose.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LANGLEY. I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] first, as he arose first.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. After the last census was taken, there was a mid census taken, was there not?

Mr. LANGLEY. There have been several special inquiries; yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Some attempt was made at the taking of that mid census, as I recall it, to employ old men. In fact, were they not all employed without any examination or other qualification or inquiry of any kind? Was there not put up to the Member of Congress, if he happened to be a Republican, an opportunity to name half of the men who performed certain duties when the original census was taken, without any inquiry whatever into their qualifications or fitness?

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman is mistaken about that. I do not recall any such proceeding, if I understand him.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The gentleman from Kentucky knows absolutely whether I am mistaken or not.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not recall any such state of facts as the gentleman mentions. I am not quite certain that I catch his meaning.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I call the gentleman's attention to the law, which says that preference must be given to persons whose efficiency records are satisfactory to the Director of the Census, who may accept such records in lieu of examination. The language of the law itself takes care of the efficiency of the department.

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; except that some gentlemen seem to intimate that the director will take advantage of the provision—

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not every qualification upon the powers of the director based upon the theory that he may abuse his discretion? If we are to trust him entirely, what is the use of having any provision restricting his power?

Mr. LANGLEY. It is unnecessary to answer that question.

Mr. SHERLEY. It may be embarrassing to answer it. I do not think it is unnecessary.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, that is a question of opinion. I think the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] will agree with me that it is not necessary or wise to deprive executive officers of all discretionary power; and I think he will agree with me, on the other hand, that it is unwise to leave them absolutely unlimited as to their powers of discretion.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY (continuing). That seems so self-evident that I do not see why the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] asks me the question.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I want to say this, that several times the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] who now has the floor has stated that somebody might desire to reflect upon the present Director of the Census. I want to say that I am more afraid of the Members of the House, like myself, than I am of the Director of the Census. I believe if the gentleman from Kentucky would leave the Director of the Census alone and other Members of the House, including myself, would let him alone, we would get a good census.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 39, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, in lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "when the exigencies of the service require;" and also, in line 7, the words "or other conditions;" and insert after the word "that," in line 5, the words "only after due notice to those on the eligible register of their appointment and notice from them of their refusal to accept the same."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I think that is identical with the amendment voted down.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not by any means.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio states that it is not the same amendment. It is the amendment he desired to offer, and the gentleman from Indiana objected to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is a proposition offered in place of my original amendment, which was intended to mean the same thing, and as I think did, in fact, substantially and fairly express the same idea. This amendment, it seems to me, is absolutely essential if any effect or force is to be given to the amendments already adopted by the committee. Because if you leave this section in its present form, as amended, leaving in it the words "exigencies of the service require" and "other

conditions" to be judged of solely by the Director of the Census, you may just as well have made no changes in the section. This amendment simply limits the discretion of the director to the appointment of those immediately available after he has given due notice to those who are at a distance and they, having had the opportunity, have refused appointment; then the other appointments may be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "commission," in line 2, on page 5, insert the words "within thirty days from the date of said examination."

Mr. HAMLIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is, I think, apparent to everyone who heard it read. The leading keynote this afternoon seems to have been, and I think very properly, to give speed to the passage of this bill, in order that the work of the next census may be undertaken. The statement was made by the gentleman from New Jersey this afternoon, and I think very accurately, that the usual custom of certification of the Civil Service Commission was from nine to fourteen months from the date of the examination. Under the terms of this bill the hands of the director will be tied until he receives this eligible list. Now, if no time is provided in which the Civil Service Commission can certify this eligible list the whole work of taking the census will be tied up for several months. This amendment seeks to cure that by requiring this certification within thirty days from the date of the examination, and I think that the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HAMLIN. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. Do you not think that the exigencies of the service will require a prompt certification of all who have a claim to be placed on the eligible list?

Mr. HAMLIN. I think they will be required to do so if this plan is adopted.

Mr. TAWNEY. The exigencies and demands of the service will require it; and I trust the amendment will not be adopted, because it will simply open a way for them to make another demand for increased appropriations for that additional purpose.

Mr. HAMLIN. I think the gentleman's position is hardly consistent if, as he says, the exigencies of the occasion will require them to make the certification within a reasonable time and they do make it, the fact that we require them to make it would necessarily add an additional cost.

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that it would not necessarily mean an additional cost, except in so far as it would afford the department an opportunity to base a claim for additional appropriations for meeting this requirement.

Mr. HAMLIN. I think I voice the sentiment of this House when I say that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is entirely able to take care of that sort of a claim by the Civil Service Commission. I think the sentiment of the House ought to be to require by specific statement in this bill that there should be a certification of this list in a reasonable time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 5, after the word "rating" insert: *Provided, however, That no person affected with tuberculosis shall be appointed.*

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, some little experience with forces under the Government, which are large and congested, leads me to offer this amendment. I am aware that gentlemen may say, "Where will you draw the line? How will you make the distinction?" But I prefer to put that responsibility upon the director. In our post-office in New York the employees on each of the five stories find the greatest menace to their health and that of their families is the contagion of this disease, which to-day causes more deaths than any other disease. I am informed that this census force is to consist of something like 2,000 people. That may not be exact, but at any rate it is to be a very large force. I want to arm the Director of the Census with the power, right at the threshold, to bar out those pitiable and to be pitied persons who, possessing the highest degree of mentality, able successfully to pass the mental examination, come to an appointing officer and refuse

to admit that there is any danger in their presence amongst a large body of people.

That is one of the symptoms and accompaniments of the disease. There is more danger from tuberculosis than there is from smallpox, and for their own good and for the good of the community such people ought to be rigidly excluded from such a service as this.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Would not this require also a medical examination of every applicant for appointment?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Oh, I do not think so.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. If there was not a medical examination, would not the Director of the Census lay himself liable to prosecution for damages if he made a charge that anyone had tuberculosis?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Oh, I do not think so at all. I take it for granted that one of the requirements will be a physical examination which will disclose the presence of tuberculosis.

[The time of Mr. BENNET of New York having expired, by unanimous consent, at his request, it was extended three minutes.]

Mr. BENNET of New York. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Kansas and of the House to this language:

Without regard to the law of apportionment, in the order of rating.

Now, if there is not a physical examination, then if a man or woman who passed the examination subsequently contracted smallpox or any other loathsome, dangerous, or contagious disease, the Director of the Census would be compelled to appoint such a person under the law. But I am going to assume that there will be a physical examination. Otherwise you put the Director of the Census in a position where he is bound, unless he violates the law, to appoint people without regard to their physical qualifications.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from New York permit an interruption?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. If your amendment is adopted, do you not think it ought to be accompanied with a provision requiring the applicant to file with his application a certificate of the condition of his health, such certificate to be obtained at his own expense and to be signed by some reputable physician?

Mr. BENNET of New York. I will accept that modification, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JAMES. What is the modification?

Mr. BENNET of New York. That each applicant for examination shall accompany his or her application with a certificate from a reputable physician, showing the condition of his or her health.

Mr. OLMSTED. And a photograph?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Oh, no; the gentleman is making fun of me now.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Does not the civil-service law now require that?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. So what you mean to require is what the civil-service law now requires in the case of an examination?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] has again expired. The question is on his amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman from New York modified his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. No suggestion of a modification was made to the Chair.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Then I offer the following amendment: On page 5, line 5, after the word "rating" insert:

Provided, however, That no person afflicted with tuberculosis shall be appointed, and that each applicant for appointment shall accompany his or her application with a certificate of health from some reputable physician.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 5, after the word "rating" insert:

Provided, however, That no person afflicted with tuberculosis shall be appointed, and that each applicant for appointment shall accompany his or her application with a certificate of health from some reputable physician.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. BENNET of New York) there were 57 ayes and 53 noes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CRUMPACKER and Mr. BENNET of New York.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were 71 ayes and 44 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That the Thirteenth Census shall be restricted to inquiries relating to population, to agriculture, to manufactures, and to mines and quarries. The schedules relating to population shall include for each inhabitant the name, relationship to head of family, color, sex, age, conjugal condition, place of birth, place of birth of parents, number of years in the United States, citizenship, occupation, whether or not employer or employee, school attendance, literacy, and tenure of home and whether or not a survivor of the Union or Confederate Army or Navy; and the name and address of each blind or deaf person; and for the enumeration of institutions, shall include paupers, prisoners, juvenile delinquents, insane, feeble-minded, blind, deaf and dumb, and inmates of benevolent institutions.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "employee," line 14, page 6, add "whether or not engaged in agriculture."

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, this is to carry out what we attempted to provide for in the original bill passed in the last Congress. At the time the bill was under consideration an amendment was offered by me, which was adopted. It applied to the agricultural schedule, a succeeding paragraph of the present bill. In the Senate it was agreed the purpose sought to be accomplished was a good one, but it was decided in the Senate to strike out my amendment and insert language in lieu of it in the population schedule. The words that the Senate inserted were put in the original bill after the word "occupation," and they were these: "whether or not employer or employee." My amendment is to insert, after the word "employee," in line 14, page 6, of the bill, the words "and whether or not engaged in agriculture." It is supposed that by using these words the census can be so taken as to show the number of people engaged in agriculture, distinct from all other people, regardless of occupation, in the United States. As some doubt has arisen as to whether the purpose sought would be accomplished by the Senate's language, this amendment is now offered by me to remove the doubt. I understand it has the consent of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], now in charge of the bill, and it is simply to carry out an important purpose that has not been in dispute. I do not care to further discuss the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The schedules relating to agriculture shall include name and color of occupant of each farm, tenure, acreage of farm, value of farm and improvements, value of farm implements, number and value of live stock on farms and ranges, number and value of domestic animals not on farms and ranges, and the acreage of crops as of the date of enumeration, and the acreage of crops and the quantity and value of crops and other farm products for the year ending December 31 next preceding the enumeration.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "improvements," in line 23, page 6, insert "the amount of indebtedness, if any, secured by mortgage or deed of trust on such farms."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, has the reading of the section been completed?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think the gentleman from Missouri should wait until the whole section is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the way the bill is printed that it can be read by paragraphs.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, there is no provision in the bill for ascertaining the mortgage or other farm indebtedness. In this bill we propose to go out and find the value of farms and farm improvements, but we do not propose to take into consideration at all the indebtedness on the farms. Some years ago a law was passed to ascertain the amount of farm indebtedness in the country. It cost more than a million dollars to do it, and then the information secured was not reliable because it was not taken or procured from the people who owed the money, but parties got the information by going into the recorder's office in the various counties and securing it. In every county in my district the report shows the mortgage greater than it actually was; the record does not always show the exact amount of the indebtedness, for the reason that payments made are not shown by the record. Some of the mortgages are nearly, if not almost entirely, paid off, and the records do not show the partial payments.

Now, in a few years, unless this is done, there will be another application for securing the information as to farm indebtedness in this country, and it will cost a large sum of money to take it, and this can be saved by adopting this amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that amendment will not be adopted. It will involve a great deal of additional expense. It will require a special investigation of all the records in the United States to determine the amount of mortgage encumbrance, and when that determination is made it is of no practical value, because you can not tell on the face of a record how much is due on it, how much may have been paid; and if any such inquiry is made at any time in the future, it ought not to be a part of the decennial census; it ought to be a special investigation, to be made by the permanent office.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, it is true you can not get a complete census of farm indebtedness from an examination of the records. I agree with the gentleman in that. The only way that you can get it is to ask the farmer how much mortgage indebtedness there is on the farm. It is usually a great deal less than the record shows. Of course I speak only for my own section, but in the West nearly every mortgage or deed of trust on land contains a provision giving the mortgagor the option to make payments of \$100 or any multiple thereof, and in many instances during the five years' term nearly all of that mortgage is paid off.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yielded for only a question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOOHER. Would it not be better to ascertain this indebtedness under this census? It certainly can be done more economically than in any other way.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think not, because it will require special schedules, and it will necessitate the examination of the owner of the farm personally. You can not get the information from the wife or somebody about the household, and many people perhaps may feel a little of reluctance about giving the information; and if the investigation is made at all, I repeat it ought to be made as a special investigation, conducted by the permanent Census Office. I do not think it is practicable to take it in connection with the decennial census.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOOHER and Mr. Cox of Indiana) there were—ayes 35, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 9. That the Director of the Census shall, at least six months prior to the date fixed for commencing the enumeration at the Thirtieth and each succeeding decennial census, designate the number, whether one or more, of supervisors of census for each State and Territory, the District of Columbia, Alaska, the Hawaiian Islands, and Porto Rico, and shall define the districts within which they are to act; except that the Director of the Census, in his discretion, need not designate supervisors for Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands, but in lieu thereof may employ special agents as hereinafter provided. The supervisors shall be appointed by the President: *Provided*, That the whole number of supervisors shall not exceed 330: *And provided further*, That so far as practicable and desirable the boundaries of the supervisors' districts shall conform to the boundaries of the congressional districts: *And provided further*, That if in any supervisor's district the supervisor has not been appointed and qualified ninety days preceding the date fixed for the commencement of the enumeration, or if any vacancy shall occur thereafter, either through death, removal, or resignation of the supervisor, or from any other cause, the Director of the Census may appoint a temporary supervisor or detail an employee of the Census Office to act as supervisor for that district.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 1, amend by inserting after the word "President" the following:

"By and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States."

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, the bill as it passed both Houses contained the provision which is in the amendment which I have just offered. The bill as it passed the House in the last Congress was the same as the bill is now in this respect, and it was changed in the Senate and agreed to in the House, and we might as well change this now, as it will undoubtedly be changed by the Senate.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a better plan to let the Senate make that change, if it suits them

to do it. It is a change that will not bring anything to the House or to any Member of the House, or that is likely to bring any better service to the country.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I thought the gentleman had yielded the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair also begs the gentleman's pardon, as the Chair was of that opinion also.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, it is the usual custom in all appointments made by the President to have these appointments confirmed by the Senate. I believe that that is in conformity with the Constitution. The gentleman says that it does not give anything to any Member of the House. I do not know whether it does or not. It probably will bring something to some Members of the House to have them protected in the Senate by their Senators and not to trust entirely to the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAY) there were—ayes 42, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 20. That the enumeration of the population required by section 1 of this act shall be taken as of the 15th day of April; and it shall be the duty of each enumerator to commence the enumeration of his district on that day, unless the Director of the Census in his discretion shall defer the enumeration in said district by reason of climatic or other conditions which would materially interfere with the proper conduct of the work; but in any event it shall be the duty of each enumerator to prepare the returns herebefore required to be made, except those relating to paupers, prisoners, juvenile delinquents, insane, feeble-minded, blind, deaf and dumb, and inmates of benevolent institutions, and to forward the same to the supervisor of his district within thirty days from the commencement of the enumeration of his district: *Provided*, That in any city having 5,000 inhabitants or more under the preceding census the enumeration of the population shall be commenced on the 15th day of April aforesaid and shall be completed within two weeks thereafter.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee in reference to line 21, page 17, where it says, "except those relating to paupers, prisoners, juvenile delinquents, insane, feeble-minded, blind, deaf and dumb, and inmates of benevolent institutions." This would seem to contradict the provision made in section 8 for a census of the blind, deaf, and dumb. Section 8 provides that the census shall "include the name and address of each blind or deaf person; and for the enumeration of institutions shall include paupers, prisoners, juvenile delinquents, insane, feeble-minded, blind, deaf and dumb, and inmates of benevolent institutions." Section 20, on page 17, which we have just passed, seems to except these institutions and the blind, deaf, and dumb from the enumeration.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They are to be enumerated. I think they have a special enumeration.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the Chairman understands, the enumeration of deaf, dumb, and blind is to be provided for—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is provided for in the bill. The deaf, dumb, and blind enumeration outside of institutions was not in the original bill and we put it in this bill. Section 20 says:

And to forward the same to the supervisor of his district within thirty days from the commencement of the enumeration of his district.

And it also says:

But in any event it shall be the duty of each enumerator to prepare the returns herebefore required to be made.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This does not interfere with the enumeration of the deaf, dumb, and blind.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No; this is purely administrative in reference to the time of making the report; that is all.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 21. That if any person shall receive or secure to himself any fee, reward, or compensation as a consideration for the appointment or employment of any person as enumerator or clerk or other employee, or shall in any way receive or secure to himself any part of the compensation paid to any enumerator or clerk or other employee, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$3,000 and be imprisoned not more than five years.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert the word "supervisor" before the word "enumerator" where it occurs in line 9, and again where it occurs in line 12, page 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 9, before the word "enumerator," insert the word "supervisor;" and before the word "enumerator," in line 12, insert the word "supervisor."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. What is the effect of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. DE ARMOND. The effect is to extend this offense to the receiving of compensation or reward for securing the appointment of a supervisor or dividing the fees and compensation with a supervisor.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Let the Clerk state the amendment from the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 19 of the bill to supply a clerical omission.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to return to page 19 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. After the word "persons," in line 15, page 19, I ask to insert the word "who."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 15, after the word "person" insert the word "who," so it will read "any person who is or has been an enumerator," etc.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. DALZELL having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MANN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, and had instructed him to report the bill back with the recommendations that the amendments agreed to in the committee be agreed to in the House and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CRUMPACKER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. NYE, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama, indefinitely on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 2091) for the improvement of the Chattahoochee River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2092) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase part of the McIntosh reservation, in Carroll County, Ga., and erect a monument thereon—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2093) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States to the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of improving the roads therein—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2094) granting increase of pension to survivors of the Mexican and Indian wars and to their widows—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) to construct a road from Fort McPherson, Ga., to the rifle range and military reservation near Waco, Ga.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 2096) to amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, permitting national

banking associations to make loans on farm land as security, and limiting the amount of such loans—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 2097) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Carrollton, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 2098) for the survey of Shelter River, North Carolina, with a view to the improvement of its navigation—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2099) for the survey of Core Creek, Craven County, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2100) to appropriate \$175,000 for the prosecution and extension of the work of the Office of Public Roads in the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2101) to appropriate \$500,000 for the prosecution and extension of the work of the Bureau of Soil Surveys in the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 2102) providing for the extension of the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890, to the Seventy-second Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2103) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish the village of Johnstown, Ohio, with a condemned cannon and suitable outfit of cannon balls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2104) to increase appropriation for site and erection of public building at Ashland, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2105) to provide for the erection of a public building at Cynthiana, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) for the construction of a lock and dam in the Ohio River, below mouth of Big Sandy River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 2107) to limit removals from state courts into courts of the United States in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2108) to prevent removals from state courts into courts of the United States by nonresident corporations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 2109) to provide for a national road from Americus, Ga., to Andersonville (Ga.) National Cemetery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 2110) to provide for the taxation of incomes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) authorizing experimentation by the Secretary of Agriculture in reference to cotton bollworm, cotton boll weevil, and cotton wilt disease—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2112) directing the Office of Public Roads of the Agricultural Department to advise and cooperate with state and local authorities as to the best methods of maintaining roads used as rural routes in passable condition, and to inspect and report the condition of said roads with recommendations to the Post-Office Department whenever requested by it to do so—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2113) to regulate the importation of virus that may be infectious for domestic animals—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2114) for an investigation by the Secretary of Agriculture to promote the more general use of cotton goods and materials manufactured of raw cotton in the United States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2115) to authorize the investigation and survey of swamp, wet, and overflowed lands in the valleys of the Red, the Sulphur, and the Cypress rivers, of Texas, and to devise plans and systems for the drainage of said lands—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) to provide for the erection of a public building at Clarksville, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2117) to provide for the erection of a federal building at Mount Vernon, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2118) for the enlargement of the federal building at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2119) for the erection of a new federal building for court-house, post-office, and other governmental purposes at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., and for the disposition of the

present structure—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2120) to provide for the erection of a federal building at Atlanta, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2121) for an addition or annex to the federal building at Paris, Tex., said addition or annex to consist of a separate post-office building on the site now owned by the United States—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2122) to provide for the erection of a federal building at Daingerfield, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) to provide for the erection of a federal building at Mount Pleasant, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) to provide for the erection of a federal building at Cooper, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) for the erection of a new federal building for court, post-office, and other government purposes at Jefferson, Tex., and for the disposition of the present structure—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) to provide for the erection of a federal building at Pittsburg, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) for the establishment and maintenance of libraries in the life-saving stations of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) for the erection of a suitable memorial to the mother of Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) to create a committee on interstate and foreign quarantine and public health—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) for the establishment of a fish hatchery at Paris, Tex.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to hold a contest, open to the world, to determine the best device for preventing railway collisions, wrecks, accidents, etc., and providing awards—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) to amend an act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters," approved March 3, 1883, by increasing the compensation of fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2133) increasing salaries of rural free-delivery letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," public No. 190, approved July 2, 1890, so as to make imprisonment penalty imperative and to increase penalties of fine and imprisonment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) amending an act entitled "An act requiring common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to make full reports of all accidents to the Interstate Commerce Commission," approved March 3, 1901, public No. 171, second session Fifty-sixth Congress, so as to increase the scope of the monthly accident reports, and requiring the form of said reports to be regulated and prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2136) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes," approved June 26, 1906, public No. 297, so as to enable local printers to publish return requests, advertising, etc., on stamped envelopes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2137) to provide for a world temperance conference, to be called by the President of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2138) to consolidate the Bureau of Manufactures and the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor into one bureau, to be called the "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce"—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2139) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887," and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission so as to enable it to fix and establish all freight and passenger tariffs and other charges subject to federal regulation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2140) for the insurance of deposits in national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2141) repealing section 17, chapter 296, United States Statutes at Large, volume 14, so as to discontinue mileage allowance of Members of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2142) to amend an act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900, by providing additional subsidiary silver coinage, increasing the limit to one hundred and fifty millions—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2143) for the continuance of cleaning and clearing operations on Red River above Fulton, Ark.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2144) for the continuance of cleaning and clearing operations on Sulphur River, Arkansas and Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) for continuing the cleaning and clearing operations now in progress on the waterway connecting Jefferson, Tex., and Shreveport, La.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2146) for the construction of a lock and dam at the foot of Caddo Lake and the deepening of the channel from the dam to Red River on the waterway connecting Jefferson, Tex., with Shreveport, La.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2147) to provide for the improvement of upper Red River by the construction of levees on the south bank thereof above Fulton, Ark.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) to provide for the improvement of Sulphur River by the construction of levees along both its banks from its mouth to the confluence of the Delta County forks—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) for a survey to determine the cost and practicability of constructing a canal between Red River and Sulphur River, Texas, by way of Texarkana, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2150) prohibiting the issuance and operation of federal liquor licenses in communities where state or local laws forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2151) prohibiting corporations organized outside of the District of Columbia who buy, sell, or deal in real estate, except real-estate agency or brokerage corporations, from operating in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2152) establishing fines and penalties for failure of corporations in the District of Columbia to file annual reports—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2153) establishing forfeitures and fines for false reports of corporations in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2154) prescribing annual registration fees for corporations operating in the District of Columbia and providing for enforcing payment thereof—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2155) making regulations regarding annual reports of corporations in the District of Columbia equally applicable to corporations organized outside the District of Columbia and authorized to operate within the same—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2156) to provide for repaying to rightful owners, their heirs or legal representatives, the proceeds of the cotton tax illegally collected by the United States in the State of Texas in the years 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868, and for the disposition of such proceeds as may remain unclaimed and unawarded—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2157) requiring corporations organized outside of the District of Columbia and desiring permits to operate within the same to show that 10 per cent of authorized capital has been paid in and to file with the recorder of deeds certified copies of their charters before such permits shall be issued—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 2158) providing for the erection of a public building at Littleton, Colo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 2159) to prohibit the receipt, delivery, or transmission of interstate or foreign messages, or other information to be used in connection with or furtherance of any project or transaction concerning the interstate or foreign buying or selling or otherwise dealing in futures in agricultural products or commodities, and to prohibit the interstate or for-

eign buying or selling or otherwise dealing in futures in said products and commodities—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 2160) to prevent the nullification of state antigambling laws by international or interstate transmission of race gambling bets or of racing odds—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 2161) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at Dell Rapids, S. Dak.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 2162) for the erection of a federal building for the post-office at Weatherford, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COUDREY: A bill (H. R. 2163) to compel all corporations to pay a license tax of one-tenth of 1 per cent on their capital—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 2164) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Grinnell, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 2165) to restore to certain citizens the proceeds arising from the sale of their lands under the several acts levying direct taxes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2166) providing for the disposition of the cotton-tax fund collected from the several States from 1862 to 1868, inclusive—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2167) to regulate interstate commerce in intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2168) to amend the Bowman Act, volume 22, Statutes at Large, page 485—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2169) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) establishing regular terms of the United States circuit and district courts at Aiken, S. C.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2171) to regulate and fix the fees of United States commissioners and to define their powers and duties—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2172) to limit the effect of the regulations of commerce between the several States and with foreign countries in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2173) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 3, 1875, entitled 'An act to determine the jurisdiction of circuit courts of the United States and to regulate the removal of causes from state courts, and for other purposes, and to further regulate the jurisdiction of circuit courts of the United States, and for other purposes'"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2174) to prevent the issuance by any judge of any court of the United States, inferior to the Supreme Court, of any writ of injunction, habeas corpus, or prohibition in any case wherein the validity of a law of any one of the United States, or the act of any officer of any such State done, or required to be done, in pursuance of such law, is called in question—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2175) appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States to the construction of works for the drainage or reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands belonging to the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2176) providing for the erection of a public building at Edgefield, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2177) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) to improve and extend the navigation of Salkehatchie River, in South Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2179) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2180) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Beaufort, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2181) to increase the salaries of rural free-delivery carriers of mail—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) to establish an agricultural experiment station in the Second Congressional District of the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2183) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of churches, lodges, and educational or eleemosynary institutions arising from the late civil war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) providing that the question of loyalty be not considered in certain cases before the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) providing for the transfer of the naval station at Port Royal, S. C., to the Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, as an adjunct to the naval training station, Rhode Island, and making appropriations for the improvement and maintenance of the same—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 2187) for the erection of a public building at Rapid City, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) to amend "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2189) to establish mining experiment stations, to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. NICHOLLS: A bill (H. R. 2190) declaring such persons as were engaged in the operation and construction of the United States military railroads during the war of the rebellion to have been a part of the army of the United States and having a pensionable status in accordance therewith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2191) to amend an act entitled "An act granting leaves of absence to clerks and employees in first and second class post-offices, and to employees of the Post-Office Department employed in the mail-bag repair shops connected with said department," approved October 1, 1890—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2192) to increase the pensions of the blind who served in the war with Mexico and the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) appropriating \$5,000 for the improvement of that portion of National avenue, village of West Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, Wis., abutting the grounds of the Northwestern Branch National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 2194) to incorporate the trustees of the Chi Psi fraternity—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2195) for the relief of certain surgeons, passed assistant surgeons, and assistant surgeons, United States Navy, retired—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2196) for the relief of war telegraphers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2197) to provide for the appointment and compensation of professors and instructors at the Naval Academy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States"—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2199) for the erection of a building for the criminal insane in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) for the establishment of an asylum for the criminal insane in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) to amend the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) for free lectures—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) to purchase the original painting of Gen. Philip H. Sheridan on his favorite horse Rienzi, known as "Sheridan's Ride"—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) to change the proceedings for admission to the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) to repeal section 3186, Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) creating a commission to investigate weights and measures, etc.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2207) to grant additional grade to officers and veterans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint certain persons in the Regular Army and place them upon the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) to regulate rank of officers in the army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) to create in the War and Navy departments a roll to be known as the civil war retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 2211) to provide for the improvement of the waterways of the United States and Territories—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 2212) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) to provide for the erection of a light-house on Pilar Point, at the entrance to Half Moon Bay, California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) to regulate the coming into and the residence within the United States of Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Tartars, Malays, Afghans, East Indians, Lascars, Hindoos, and other persons of the Mongolian or Asiatic race, and persons of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Tartar, Malayan, Afghan, East Indian, Hindoo, or other Mongolian extraction, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2216) to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2217) to amend the act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2218) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded fungicides, Paris greens, lead arsenates, and other insecticides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 2219) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Valley City, Barnes County, N. Dak.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 2220) providing beacon lights in Bogue Sound, Carteret County, N. C.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2221) authorizing the retirement of light-house keepers and the payment to them of a pension—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for equipping and maintaining a weather bureau observatory at Newbern, N. C.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) to increase the salaries of light-house keepers—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) appropriating the sum of \$10,000 for repairs and improvement of the roadway to the national cemetery at Newbern, N. C.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) to provide for the defense of Beaufort Harbor, North Carolina, and the inland waters of the State tributary thereto—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2226) to provide for terms of the United States district and circuit courts at Goldsboro, N. C.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) providing for a survey of New River, in Onslow County, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) for the improvement of navigation of Carrot Island Slough, Carteret County, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) for the survey of Northeast Cape Fear River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) directing the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made of New River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) to authorize a survey of Bogue Inlet, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2232) amending an act approved June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to im-

mediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) authorizing a survey to be made of Queens Creek, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2234) for the survey of Big Swift Creek from Vanceboro to Gardners Ford, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2235) to provide for the erection of a levee or levees upon the Cape Fear River above Wilmington, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2236) for the relief of the State of North Carolina—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2237) to provide for erection of a memorial to Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2238) to fix a license fee and regulate soliciting orders, making sales or exhibits of women's wearing apparel or head gear by sample, picture, or model of any description, by nonresidents within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 178 of an act entitled "An act to revise, consolidate, and amend the statutes relating to the Post-Office Department," approved June 8, 1872—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2240) prescribing the mode of executing the death sentence within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) to transfer jurisdiction of a part of the Washington Aqueduct to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) to regulate the compensation of stationary firemen employed in the public buildings of the United States—to the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2243) to pay all federal soldiers honorably discharged \$2 a day while confined in confederate military prisons thirty days or more—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 2244) to authorize the purchase of the statue America, by Cyrus Cobb—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2245) for the erection of a replica of John Quincy Adams Ward's statue of Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) providing for the appointment of probation officers and for the suspension of sentence in United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2247) increasing the pensions of army nurses—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) declaring section 6 of act 781, passed by the United States Philippine Commission, to be null and void—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2249) requiring corporations operating street railways within the District of Columbia to equip open cars with guard rails, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2250) providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 2251) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Williston, N. Dak.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Dickinson, N. Dak.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Jamestown, N. Dak.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Mandan, N. Dak.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 2255) to provide for the erection of a public building at Brookings, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 2256) for the erection of a public building at Rapid City, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2257) to provide for the erection of a public building at Brookings, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 2258) granting right of

way over certain sections of the Grand Canyon Monument Reserve in Arizona to the Grand Canyon Scenic Railroad Company—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Douglas, Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2260) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Globe, Ariz.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2261) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Nogales, in the Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 2262) to provide for standard packages, grades, and marks for apples in closed packages entering into interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROW: A bill (H. R. 2263) to authorize J. W. Vance, L. L. Allen, O. F. Helwig, and H. V. Worley, of Pierce City, Mo.; A. B. Durnil, D. H. Kemp, Sig Solomon, J. J. Davis, S. A. ChapPELL, and W. M. West, of Monett, Mo.; M. L. Coleman, M. T. Davis, Jared R. Woodfill, jr., J. H. Jarrett, and William H. Standish, of Aurora, Lawrence County, Mo.; and L. S. Meyer, F. S. Heffernan, Robert A. Moore, William H. Johnson, J. P. McCammon, M. W. Colbaugh, and W. H. Schreiber, of Springfield, Greene County, Mo., to construct a dam across the James River, in Stone County, Mo., and to divert a portion of its waters through a tunnel into the said river again to create electric power—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 2264) to increase the compensation of rural letter carriers to \$90 per month, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 2265) for the erection of a memorial monument at Fort Recovery, Ohio—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 2266) making appropriations for the improvement of the Missouri River from its mouth to Sioux City, Iowa—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2267) to provide for dredging, improving, and maintaining the channels of the Osage and Gasconade rivers within the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2268) providing for the payment of certain coupons of bonds issued pursuant to an act of the legislature of the State of California to pay the expenses of suppressing Indian hostilities—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2269) construing the provisions of sections 2304 to 2309 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLCOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) for the relief of the heirs of George B. Simpson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 17) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, so that it shall contain a recognition of God and shall begin with the words "In the name of God"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 18) to change and improve the present method of distributing vegetable seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 19) empowering the President to appoint a commission of physicians to test the arsenization theory for the prevention of yellow fever—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish condemned cannon for park decoration at Saluda, S. C.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 21) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish condemned cannon for park decoration at Edgefield, S. C.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 22) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to cause a survey and investigation to be made of the swamp and tidal lands of the Second Congressional District of South Carolina, to determine the feasibility and cost of leveeing and draining said lands, and the benefits to agriculture and the public health which would result therefrom—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 23) authorizing the occupancy of reservation No. 68 in the city of Washington, D. C., as a site for and erection of a pedestal of a statue in honor of the late Rev. Dennis J. Stafford, D. D.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McCALL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 24) for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 25) relative to gaps in the published records of United States history—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 6) authorizing consular and diplomatic agents to report on income tax in foreign countries, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Resolution (H. Res. 24) to consider the bill of the House (H. R. 1033) entitled "A bill to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses"—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAMES: Resolution (H. Res. 25) requesting the President to advise Congress as to the need of an income tax, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Resolution (H. Res. 26) to investigate the validity of acts under which an income tax has been collected—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAYTON: Resolution (H. Res. 27) providing payment for the services of an additional pair clerk to the minority—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Resolution (H. Res. 28) for facilitating the distribution of public documents—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 29) providing for Committee on Levees and Improvements of Rivers not Tributary to the Mississippi—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 30) providing for Committee on Levees and Improvements of Rivers Tributary to the Mississippi—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 31) for investigation of expenditures in Navy Department—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 32) for investigation of expenditures in the Department of Justice—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 33) for investigation of expenditures in the Treasury Department—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 34) for investigation of expenditures in the State Department—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 35) for investigation of expenditures in the War Department—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 36) for investigation of expenditures in the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 37) for investigation of expenditures on public buildings—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 38) for the investigation of expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 39) for the investigation of expenditures in the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 40) for investigation of expenditures in the Interior Department—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 2270) granting a pension to Sarah Hodge—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2271) granting an increase of pension to Martin R. Gentry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2272) for the relief of John A. Brown—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2273) for the relief of H. T. Cunningham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2274) for the relief of Jesse J. Bull—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2275) for the relief of the city of Columbus, Ga.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2276) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perkinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2277) for the relief of Mary Bethune Hanserd—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2278) for the relief of Sidney T. Dupuy and George R. Dupuy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2279) for the relief of the heirs of S. H. Hill, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2280) for the relief of the heirs of Willis Miller, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) for the relief of W. T. Strickland, administrator of John M. Strickland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2282) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. L. Gordon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) for the relief of the legal representatives of Edward Haile, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2284) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry Callier, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2285) for the relief of the legal representatives of Anderson Abercrombie, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2286) for the relief of the legal representatives of E. H. Abercrombie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2287) for the relief of the legal representatives of F. M. T. Brannan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) to compensate the legal representatives of Henry S. Castellaw for stock and provisions taken for the use of the Army of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) to compensate P. K. Leathers for services rendered the United States in the prosecution of William T. Head and others in the circuit court for the northern district of Georgia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) to compensate W. T. Godwin for transportation, rent, and supplies furnished United States authorities engaged in suppressing a riot in Harris County, Ga., in 1867—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2291) for the relief of Christopher L. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) for the relief of the heirs of John G. W. Brooks—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2293) granting a pension to John P. Swigert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2294) granting a pension to August Hofacker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2295) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Mathews—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2296) granting an increase of pension to George W. Boner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2297) granting an increase of pension to John H. Blessing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2298) granting an increase of pension to Harry Remer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2299) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Blunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2300) granting an increase of pension to John Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2301) granting an increase of pension to Gifford Ramey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2302) granting an increase of pension to Moses Stockdale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2303) granting an increase of pension to Eli Garrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2304) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of S. Mains—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Solomon Holtsberry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2306) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Milton A. Romig—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2307) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel V. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARCLAY: A bill (H. R. 2308) granting an increase of pension to John V. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2309) granting an increase of pension to Robert Slutman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2310) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wegner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2311) granting an increase of pension to Albison Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2312) granting an increase of pension to S. Guckenberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2313) granting an increase of pension to Clay Doolittle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2314) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Rowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2315) granting an increase of pension to Frederick B. Huchting—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2316) granting an increase of pension to Andrew K. M. Pickert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2317) granting an increase of pension to Fred W. Verkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2318) granting an increase of pension to John F. Hoben—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2319) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kolhamer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2320) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Forrester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2321) granting an increase of pension to William J. Courtney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2322) granting an increase of pension to George Larson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2323) granting an increase of pension to William L. Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2324) granting an increase of pension to M. J. McRaith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2325) granting an increase of pension to John Moran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2326) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Tyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2327) granting an increase of pension to Martin P. Broberg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2328) granting an increase of pension to John J. Moloney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2329) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Vine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2330) granting an increase of pension to George H. Fisler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2331) granting an increase of pension to John Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2332) granting a pension to Charles Dillon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2333) granting a pension to Fred Meyer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2334) granting a pension to John H. Neumann—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2335) to remove the charge of desertion from record of Patrick Powers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2336) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Leonard Seis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2337) for the relief of Carl Hartman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 2338) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Melendy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2339) granting an increase of pension to Frederick C. Waterman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2340) granting an increase of pension to Albert Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2341) granting an increase of pension to Elias Stoneburner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2342) granting an increase of pension to William Bronze—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2343) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Deems—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2344) granting an increase of pension to Adam Stoker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2345) granting an increase of pension to Patrick H. Overman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2346) granting an increase of pension to William I. Milligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2347) granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Bryant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2348) granting an increase of pension to William Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2349) granting an increase of pension to William V. Grose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2350) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Rowlands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2351) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Harlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2352) granting an increase of pension to John W. Kemp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2353) granting an increase of pension to Addison N. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2354) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton T. Faris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2355) granting an increase of pension to Michael Fetter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2356) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Gilliland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 2357) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Noble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2358) granting an increase of pension to John S. Lewis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2359) granting a pension to James A. Coyne—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2360) for the relief of Mrs. Matilde Chaplin and her infant son—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2361) for the relief of Adolph M. Cohen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2362) for the relief of Harry G. Walthour, heir of Simeon Walthour, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2363) for the relief of Z. T. De Loach, of Bulloch County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2364) for the relief of Jacob Cohen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2365) for the relief of B. C. Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2366) for the relief of Mrs. V. E. Sikes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2367) for the relief of Thomas McFarlane—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2368) for the relief of J. Caples Mallonee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2369) for the relief of Ellen Blount—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2370) for the relief of J. J. Nease—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2371) for the relief of Dr. C. D. Royall—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2372) for the relief of J. B. Shearouse—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2373) for the relief of R. Boatright—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2374) for the relief of Elizabeth T. Belt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2375) for the relief of Abraham Leffler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2376) for the relief of the white Baptist Church at Sunbury, in Liberty County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2377) for the relief of the Jerusalem Evangelical Lutheran Church, Ebenezer, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2378) for the relief of the Lutheran Church of the Ascension, of Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2379) for the relief of the First Presbyterian Church of Darien, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2380) for the relief of the heirs at law of Samuel White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2381) for the relief of A. F. Mira, or his heirs at law—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2382) for the relief of the heirs of M. M. Wilson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2383) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. M. E. Elders—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2384) for the relief of the heirs of A. Clark, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2385) for the relief of the heirs of Richard B. Sconyers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2386) for the relief of the heirs at law of the late Joseph S. Claghorn and John Cunningham, both now deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2387) for the relief of the heirs of William A. Baggs, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2388) for the relief of the heirs of Francis H. McLeod—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of the heirs at law of Charles Evans, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2390) for the relief of the heirs of John Brannen, deceased, of Bulloch County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2391) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph V. Connerat, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2392) for the relief of the heirs of Frederick R. Wyly, deceased, of Effingham County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2393) for the relief of the estate of John W. Anderson, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2394) for the relief of the estate of C. Royal, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2395) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Rosana McGuire—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2396) for the relief of the estate of Mary Lloyd, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2397) to pay to the heirs of Lieut. Col. John McIntosh, late of McIntosh County, Ga., certain moneys due for his services in the war of the American Revolution—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 2398) granting an increase of pension to Adam Hepp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2399) granting an increase of pension to James H. Robeson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 2400) granting an increase of pension to James L. Waller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2401) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Watts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2402) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Weathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2403) granting an increase of pension to John S. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2404) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Stinnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2405) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Sparks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2406) granting an increase of pension to J. H. O. Sutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2407) granting an increase of pension to John Starr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2408) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2409) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Shewmake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2410) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Pruitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2411) granting an increase of pension to Horatio M. McGaughey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2412) granting an increase of pension to Warren Mallory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2413) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Mattocks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2414) granting an increase of pension to Edward C. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2415) granting an increase of pension to Amos W. Littlejohn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2416) granting an increase of pension to Lowery C. Carlton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2417) granting an increase of pension to John W. Lay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2418) granting a pension to James Keef—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2419) granting an increase of pension to D. R. Jamison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2420) granting an increase of pension to John A. Harper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2421) granting an increase of pension to Elias Yarbrough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2422) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2423) granting a pension to James L. Stevens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2424) to correct the military record of John Smith, Company K, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 2425) granting a pension to John Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2426) granting a pension to William England—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2427) granting a pension to Henry G. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2428) granting a pension to Sophrona Pursley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2429) granting a pension to John Gatts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2430) granting a pension to Samuel A. Gott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2431) granting a pension to Napoleon B. Goodnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2432) granting a pension to Sarah F. Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2433) granting a pension to Thomas J. Gordon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2434) granting a pension to I. T. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2435) granting a pension to Charles W. Gist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2436) granting a pension to William David Allee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2437) granting a pension to R. C. Goswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2438) granting a pension to Fielding W. Means—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2439) granting a pension to Thomas Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2440) granting a pension to Samuel M. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2441) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Rinkert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2442) granting an increase of pension to James A. Ellison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2443) granting an increase of pension to James A. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2444) granting an increase of pension to Ira T. Bronson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2445) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2446) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Braswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2447) granting an increase of pension to John B. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2448) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2449) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Sheridan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2450) granting an increase of pension to John W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2451) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Weese—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2452) granting an increase of pension to James Dodson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2453) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Weldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2454) to correct the military record of Henry Stuffleham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2455) to correct the military record of Richard D. Shackelford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2456) for the relief of the First Baptist Church of Springfield, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2457) for the relief of the widow and heirs of John A. Stephens, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 2458) granting a pension to Herbert H. Skinner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2459) granting a pension to Charles Francis Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2460) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Messinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2461) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bingham Corey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2462) granting an increase of pension to William T. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2463) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2464) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Loudon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2465) granting an increase of pension to James Wardell Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2466) for the relief of Jasper J. Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2467) for the relief of Jeremiah C. Conkling—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2468) for the relief of Thomas P. Curran—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2469) to provide for payment of the claims of certain religious orders in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2470) to provide for payment of the claims

of the Roman Catholic Church in Porto Rico—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2471) for the relief of W. A. White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2472) for the relief of Nancy Pierson, widow of J. H. Pierson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2473) for the relief of Nancy E. Wright, heir of Melvil Wilkerson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 2474) granting an increase of pension to J. L. Adams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2475) granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. George—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2476) granting an increase of pension to George J. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2477) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Bratten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2478) granting an increase of pension to James W. Crook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2479) granting an increase of pension to William Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2480) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Adcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2481) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2482) granting a pension to Rufus W. Pearson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 2483) granting a pension to Lucinda F. Slater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2484) granting a pension to Melvina J. Swiger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2485) granting a pension to Elizabeth Barnhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2486) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Brubaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2487) granting an increase of pension to John M. Null—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2488) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2489) granting an increase of pension to Mahala C. Lydick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 2490) granting an increase of pension to George W. Damron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2491) granting an increase of pension to Stanley Copley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2492) granting an increase of pension to John W. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2493) for the relief of West Virginia state troops—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2494) granting a pension to Nancy E. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2495) granting a pension to Henry T. Dawson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2496) granting an increase of pension to Alwilda A. Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2497) to increase the pension of Mexican war survivors and their widows—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2498) for the relief of John Gentry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2499) for the relief of R. F. Pippin, of Putnam County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2500) granting bounty and pay to Joseph P. Rollins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2501) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2502) granting an increase of pension to Hilar R. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2503) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Patton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2504) granting an increase of pension to Stella Pritchard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 2505) for the relief of Samuel M. Blair—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2506) for the relief of Arthur R. Henderson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2507) for the relief of Paul D. Walbridge—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2508) for the relief of Herbert H. Russell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2509) for the relief of the legal representatives of Paul Curtis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2510) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph E. Wakefield—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2511) to appropriate the sum of \$4,000, to be paid to Alfred Roberts for personal injuries received at the United States custom-house in Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 2512) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Mundy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2513) granting an increase of pension to James S. Daugherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2514) granting a pension to Henry A. Tortat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2515) granting a pension to Charles S. Munger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2516) granting a pension to Warren W. Braman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2517) granting a pension to Charles Windolph—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2518) for the relief of Garland & Bergh—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2519) for the relief of William J. Allen—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2520) for the relief of Lee Stover—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2521) for the relief of Isaac Bettelyoun—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2522) for the relief of the First National Bank of Bellefourche, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2523) granting an increase of pension to John N. Raley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2524) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Duncan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2525) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Wilkison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2526) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Devers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2527) granting an increase of pension to John M. Dickerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLLS: A bill (H. R. 2528) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles H. Shippey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2529) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Thomas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 2530) granting an increase of pension to Jesse H. Darnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2531) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Vanness—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2532) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Galley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 2533) granting a pension to Kate M. Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2534) granting a pension to Martha M. del B. Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2535) granting an increase of pension to Richard Esmond—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2536) to correct the military record of Bartholomew Cronin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2537) to correct the military record of Roswell M. Shurtleff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2538) for the relief of Mary Murray, sister, and the heirs at law of Michael Murray, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2539) for the relief of Tracey Edson—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2540) for the relief of Winfield S. Ferdon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2541) to correct the War Department records of Henry Donovan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2542) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust and settle the account of James M. Wilbur with the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2543) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Denny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2544) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Stroud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2545) for the relief of the heirs of Wesley W. Wallace—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 2546) granting a pension to Dora Dee Walker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2547) granting an increase of pension to Annie B. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2548) for the relief of S. R. Ihly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2549) for the relief of the trustees of Columbia Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2550) for the relief of the trustees of Steep Bottom Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2551) for the relief of Mount Pleasant Baptist Church, of Barnwell County, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2552) for the relief of Great Salkehatchie Baptist Church, of Barnwell County, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2553) for the relief of Bethesda Baptist Church, of Bamberg County, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2554) for the relief of William P. Scott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2555) for the relief of William A. Chisolm, administrator of William S. Chaplin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2556) for the relief of R. A. Sisson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2557) for the relief of Abram Gilchrist—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2558) for the relief of Thomas B. Ellis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2559) for the relief of E. Youmans—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2560) for the relief of W. W. Weekley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2561) for the relief of J. E. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2562) for the relief of Pierson Peeples—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2563) for the relief of W. J. Peeples—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2564) for the relief of A. R. Speaks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2565) for the relief of Michael De Loach—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2566) for the relief of James T. Dowling—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2567) for the relief of G. R. Smook—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2568) for the relief of Alden R. Holden—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2569) for the relief of Miss Evalina A. E. Fripp—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2570) for the relief of Jane A. Sanders, widow of Edward W. Sanders—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2571) for the relief of John H. Ruddell, administrator of the estate of Reuben R. Turner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2572) for the relief of the heirs of Matthew Ready, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2573) for the relief of Harmony Lodge, No. 17, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, at Barnwell, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2574) for the relief of the heirs of Daniel P. Jenkins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2575) for the relief of the heirs of T. B. Fripp, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2576) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. John W. Kirk, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2577) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph G. Thorpe, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of the heirs of Elizabeth T. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2579) for the relief of the heirs of Richard Reynolds, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2580) for the relief of the heirs of W. F. Matthews, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2581) for the relief of the heirs of Allen Fanning, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2582) for the relief of the heirs of Philip Kitching, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2583) for the relief of the heirs at law of William Corley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2584) for the relief of the estate of Stephen A. Kittles, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2585) for the relief of the estate of John Fripp, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2586) for the relief of the estate of Richard N. Kittles, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2587) for the relief of the estate of Simon Brown, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 2588) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Waggoner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2589) granting an increase of pension to James T. Atchison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2590) granting an increase of pension to John W. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2591) granting a pension to Emma T. Reid—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 2592) granting an increase of pension to Oscar F. Corson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2593) granting an increase of pension to William H. Littlefield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2594) granting an increase of pension to Reuben C. Moulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2595) granting an increase of pension to Francis R. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWASEY: A bill (H. R. 2596) granting an increase of pension to James Sidlinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2597) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. Marston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2598) granting an increase of pension to Winfield Scott Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2599) granting an increase of pension to Edward K. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2600) granting an increase of pension to Hosea B. Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2601) granting an increase of pension to William Foye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2602) granting an increase of pension to Patrick A. Galvin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2603) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Sanborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2604) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Lapham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2605) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Comery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2606) granting an increase of pension to Ansel G. Marston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2607) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bigelow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2608) granting an increase of pension to Alvin A. Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2609) granting an increase of pension to Eliab Averill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2610) granting a pension to John Aldrich—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2611) granting a pension to George I. Leonard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2612) granting a pension to Freeman B. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2613) granting a pension to Daniel P. Hobart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2614) granting a pension to Mary K. Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2615) granting a pension to Sarah E. Averill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2616) granting a pension to Margaret E. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2617) granting a pension to Luella F. Sessions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2618) to remove charge of desertion from record of Francis G. French, alias Frank Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2619) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Rollins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2620) to remove charge of desertion from record of Frederick W. Buck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2621) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frank Cooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2622) to remove charge of desertion from record of Chauncey M. Allard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2623) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of John C. Warren, alias John Stevens—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2624) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus M. Pixley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2625) granting an increase of pension to Andrew McIlvain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2626) granting an increase of pension to Richard Wait—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2627) granting an increase of pension to John C. Dawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2628) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2629) granting an increase of pension to William F. Davison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2630) granting an increase of pension to William R. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2631) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. McKee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2632) granting an increase of pension to William H. Zombra—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2633) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2634) granting an increase of pension to Joshua F. Whips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2635) granting an increase of pension to John Macklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2636) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Swank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2637) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Strain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2638) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2639) granting an increase of pension to John F. Sutphin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2640) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Anne Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2641) granting an increase of pension to Anna N. Burnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2642) granting a pension to Jeanette Blandy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2643) granting a pension to Levi H. Mahanna—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2644) granting a pension to Bertha Greaves—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2645) granting a pension to Pearl L. Phillips—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2646) granting a pension to Sarah E. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2647) granting a pension to Frances E. McKenna—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2648) for the relief of Harry W. Krumm, postmaster at Columbus, Ohio—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2649) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph White, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2650) for the relief of Robert W. Caldwell, First Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2651) granting a pension to Jeremiah R. Whitsell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2652) granting a pension to James R. Thornton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 2653) granting an in-

crease of pension to James Shoemaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2654) granting an increase of pension to Isreal F. Shirley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2655) granting an increase of pension to George W. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2656) granting an increase of pension to Jehu Madden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2657) granting an increase of pension to John Arras—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2658) granting an increase of pension to Frank Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2659) granting a pension to Nettie Metzgar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2660) for the relief of Thomas N. Boyle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2661) to correct the military record of John Kearns—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2662) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Murtha—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2663) granting a pension to Mabel G. Gehrke—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 2664) granting an increase of pension to Forest M. Lentz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 2665) for the relief of the heirs of John Ferrel, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2666) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George M. Thomas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 2667) granting a pension to Adolph Weil—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2668) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Young—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 2669) for the relief of the estate of James M. Thompson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2670) granting a pension to John Patterson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 2671) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the adjudication of certain claims by the Court of Claims," approved January 9, 1903—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 2672) granting a pension to Jesse W. Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2673) granting a pension to James C. Tyron—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2674) granting an increase of pension to W. P. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2675) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Gunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2676) granting an increase of pension to Meredith T. Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2677) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2678) granting an increase of pension to Catherine R. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2679) granting an increase of pension to George Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2680) granting an increase of pension to James C. Simmons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2681) for the relief of Samuel P. Dresser—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2682) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William E. Miller and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2683) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John W. Brooks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2684) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the trustees of the Christian Church of Sturgeon, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2685) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the trustees of the First Baptist Church of Jefferson City, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 2686) granting an increase

of pension to Amelia Cutler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 2687) granting an increase of pension to William R. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2688) granting an increase of pension to Edward R. Roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2689) granting an increase of pension to James Nunan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2690) granting an increase of pension to Enoch M. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James F. Larimore, Solomon F. Brown, Daniel H. Groves, James Cain, Jacob E. West, Thomas C. De Witt, William D. Parks, and William Vorhees—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Hicksville (Ohio) Fair Company, favoring a national highways commission and federal aid in construction of public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Paulding Grange, of Paulding, Ohio, favoring Davis bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Eli Garnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of J. R. Elder, of Walhonding, and Hoover Merchandise Company, of Canton, Ohio, favoring reduction of duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Holmes County (Ohio) citizens, favoring a national highways commission and appropriation for federal aid in construction and improvement of highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Kearns—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Arras—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia: Petition of Elan Local, No. 7939, Farmers' Educational Cooperative Union of America, favoring legislation to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Hayard Peirce, of Frankfort, Me., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petitions of N. H. Rohardson, of Soddon; B. F. Mackey, of Mackey; B. B. S. Grocery Company, R. James, F. M. Cattle, F. M. Cassels, and T. J. Woodliff, of Gadsden, all in the State of Alabama, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, Branch No. 15, of Milwaukee, Wis., against decision of Justice Wright—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of National Association of Box Manufacturers, of Chicago, Ill., favoring increase of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James H. Robeson—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Centralia, Ill., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Effingham (Ill.) Lodge, No. 1016, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring the preservation of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of County Line Grange, No. 1751, favoring the Davis bill (H. R. 18204), providing for industrial education—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of B. M. Morey and others, of Durand, Ill., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Forest M. Lentz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of citizens of Bowbells, N. Dak., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petitions of Thomas Randall & Son, of Amboy; Martin B. Johnson, of Garvin; James Faley, of Mapleton; F. A. Torrance & Son, of Worthington; P. McGrath, of

Good Thunder; Thomas Madsen, of Sherburn; B. Bosch, of Balton; F. S. Brady and two others, of Avoca; and Bieler & Robson, of Heron Lake, all in the State of Minnesota, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Mullen Brothers and 16 others, of Medilla; A. W. Ebert and 6 others, Brewster; Wilson & Evans Brothers and 20 others, of Pipestone; David Rempel and 11 others, of Mountain Lake; H. A. Zettel and 5 others, of Welcome; Crowley & Brattsberg and 7 others, of Ellsworth; and C. S. Howard and 11 others, of Edgerton, all in the State of Minnesota, against parcels-post and postal savings bank legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of E. A. Matschke and 37 others, of Westbrook, Minn., against duty on teas and coffees—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Delilla McGuire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Business Men's Association of Norwalk, Conn., against removal of duty on wood pulp and paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: Petition of A. B. Barnett and 51 others, of Rocklick, W. Va., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lodge No. 294, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an appropriation to create a reserve in the State of Wyoming for the protection of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of Retail Grocers' Association of Des Moines, Iowa, against a tax on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of William Roth, of Woodsfield, Ohio, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, joint resolution of Ohio legislature, against any reduction of the tariff on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of the estate of James N. Thompson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Oronogo Circle Mining Company, favoring a duty on zinc ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a petition of the National Association of Box Manufacturers, of Chicago, Ill., against reduction of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petitions of W. F. Cunningham, of Blandinsville; R. Hudson, of Oquawka; and Scott Brothers & Co., of Monmouth, all in the State of Illinois, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. W. Wine & Co., of Macomb, Ill., favoring modification of tariff on oilcloth—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of Daniel Walker and two other citizens of Lapeer, Mich., for H. R. 15837, in aid of highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Petition of citizens of Huron, S. Dak., for repeal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of certain residents of Benkelman, Nebr., against parcels-post and postal savings bank bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Quincy (Mass.) Lodge, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring a reserve for the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Petition of Central Labor Union, of Batavia, N. Y., against piecework system in United States navy-yards and arsenals—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SWASEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John C. Warren—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Winfield S. Howe and James Sidlinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of M. T. Jameson & Co., of Owls Head; Warren M. Dam & Co., of Bath; J. T. Gay, jr., and Benner & Chute, of Waldoboro; C. S. Staples, of North Haven; C. H. Record, of Auburn; John H. Stacey, of Popham Beach; T. W. Sullivan, of Hurricane Isle; and B. Perley Putnam, of Rumford, all in the State of Maine, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: Petition of Cairo (Ill.) Lodge of Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an American elk reservation in Wyoming—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition for appropriation to improve Shelter River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petition of Joseph Turkes, of Celina, Ohio, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 19, 1909.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Edward E. Hale.

The Vice-President being absent, the President pro tempore, WILLIAM P. FRYE, took the chair.

MURPHY J. FOSTER, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, BENJAMIN F. SHIVELY, a Senator from the State of Indiana, and WILLIAM J. STONE, a Senator from the State of Missouri, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last, when, on the request of Mr. PENROSE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. PENROSE presented the credentials of GEORGE T. OLIVER, chosen by the legislature of Pennsylvania a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term ending March 3, 1911, caused by the resignation of Philander C. Knox, which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. OLIVER is present, and I ask that the oath of office may be administered to him.

Mr. OLIVER was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. PENROSE, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 30,000 copies of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1033) providing for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PRINTING OF TARIFF BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

House concurrent resolution 5.

Resolved by the House of Representatives. (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the two Houses 30,000 copies of the bill of the House (H. R. 1438) entitled "A bill to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," with an index thereto, and the same number of the report thereon, 25,000 copies of said report to be accompanied with the views of the minority, all in document form, 9,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 21,000 copies for the use of the House.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 1033. An act to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Census.

Mr. HALE. As it was part of the arrangement when the Senate adjourned on Tuesday that no legislative business should be done to-day, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 22, 1909, at 12 o'clock meridian.